

CHRIST IN TYPE  
AND PROPHECY

P. 4. 102

From the Library of  
Professor William Henry Green

Bequeathed by him to  
the Library of

Princeton Theological Seminary

BS 648

.5. M12















# CHRIST IN TYPE AND PROPHECY.

BY

✓  
Rev. A. J. MAAS, S.J.,

*Professor of Oriental Languages in Woodstock College, Md.*

VOL. I.

NEW YORK, CINCINNATI, CHICAGO

**BENZIGER BROTHERS,**

*Printers to the Holy Apostolic See.*

1893.

## APPROBATION.

Cum opus cui titulus est "Christ in Type and Prophecy," a P. A. J. Maas, nostrae Societatis sacerdote compositum aliqui eiusdem Societatis revisores, quibus id commissum fuit, recognoverint et in lucem edi posse probaverint; facultatem concedimus, ut typis mandetur, si ita iis, ad quos pertinet, videbitur.

In quorem fidem has litteras manu nostra subscriptas et sigillo Societatis nostrae munitas dedimus.

T. J. CAMPBELL, S.J.

NEO-EBOR., die vii. Non. Jul., anno 1893.

**Imprimatur.**

✠ MICHAEL AUGUSTINUS,

*Archiep. Neo-Eboracensis.*

NEO-EBOR., die ix. Cal. August, anno 1893.

## PREFACE.

---

WHEN St. Luke tells us (Acts xi. 26) that "at Antioch the disciples were first *named* Christians," he implies that they *were* Christians before they bore the name. If Christian means a believer in Christ, all that have ever believed in the Messiah—the Hebrew equivalent for Christ—have been Christians. And since "there is no other name under heaven given to men whereby we must be saved" (Acts iv. 12), all that have been saved from Adam to Noe, from Noe to Abraham, from Abraham to Moses, from Moses to Jesus Christ, and from Jesus Christ to our own day, have been Christians, or believers in the Messiah. It does not follow from this that the Messianic dispensation has been at a standstill ever since the time of Adam. As the sunlight has its dawn, its increase, and its noonday brightness, illumining the whole earth, so has the Sun of Justice his dawn immediately after the fall of our first parents, his increase under the dispensations of the four great mediators of the Old Testament, and his noonday brightness on Thabor, Calvary, and Mount Olivet, whence he "enlighteneth every man that cometh into this world" (John i. 9). It is the object of the present work to study the rise and progress and supreme splendor of this Light of the World from the inspired sources supplied by God's own goodness and infinite wisdom.

The subject is as many-sided as it is important and interesting. For it may be treated as a weapon against the Jew and unbeliever, as a crutch for the feeble in the faith, as

an everflowing fountain for the dogmatic theologian, as a topic for the preacher, as a meditation for the devout, as a series of interesting facts for the historian and the psychologist. Without extending this treatise to the length that would be required if each of these different views were the sole object of the work, the author has endeavored to combine them all in such a manner that the reader may readily adapt the subject to his own special purpose. The prophecies have been arranged under the eight heads of the Genealogy, the Birth, the Childhood, the Names, the Offices, the Public Life, the Suffering, and the Glory of the Messiah. This division does not imply that each prediction foretells only one event in the life of our Saviour, nor does it neglect the chronological development of the Messianic doctrine, as a glance at the table of contents will show; but it has been adopted chiefly to impress the reader with the truth that the whole life of Jesus Christ has been the object of prophetic vision and divine revelation.

It is with sincere sorrow that the author surrenders a work that has afforded him so many hours of interior joy and consolation, but also with the lively hope "that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of Glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and of revelation, in the knowledge of him" (Eph. i. 17).

WOODSTOCK COLLEGE, MD.,

*Feast of the Assumption of Our Lady, 1893.*



# CONTENTS.

## INTRODUCTION.

### CHAPTER I.

#### HISTORY AND FORM OF THE PROPHECY-ARGUMENT.

	PAGE
1. History of the prophecy-argument.....	13
<i>a.</i> Jesus uses it.....	13
<i>b.</i> The apostles use the argument.....	14
<i>c.</i> The evangelists use it.....	15
<i>d.</i> The patristic use of the argument.....	16
<i>e.</i> The progressive development of Messianic prophecy.....	17
<i>f.</i> Why the argument was treated so frequently.....	18
<i>α.</i> In England.....	18
<i>β.</i> In France.....	19
<i>γ.</i> In Germany.....	19
<i>δ.</i> In Germany, continued.....	20
<i>ε.</i> The rationalist's historical method.....	21
<i>ζ.</i> Christian apologies.....	22
<i>η.</i> Less conservative apologies.....	23
<i>θ.</i> Works which deal partially with the prophecies.....	24
2. Dialectic form of the prophecy-argument.....	24
<i>a.</i> Major premise.....	25
<i>b.</i> Minor premise.....	26
<i>α.</i> Historical truth of the prophecies.....	26
1. The Old Testament books precede the New Testament..	27
2. Sibylline oracles.....	27
3. The Book of Enoch.....	28
<i>a.</i> Division of the Book of Enoch.....	29
<i>b.</i> Author of the Book of Enoch.....	30
<i>c.</i> Time of composition of the Book of Enoch.....	30
4. The Book of Jubilees.....	32
5. The Psalms of Solomon.....	33
6. The "Ascensio Mosis".....	34
7. The Revelation of Baruch.....	34
8. The Fourth Book of Esdras.....	35
9. Talmudic and Rabbinic sources.....	36
Review of the historical truth of the prophecies.....	36
<i>β.</i> Philosophical truth of the prophecies.....	37
1. Definiteness of the predictions.....	38
2. Agreement between prediction and fulfilment.....	38
3. Three exceptions.....	38
<i>a.</i> First exception, and answer.....	39
<i>b.</i> Second exception answered.....	40
<i>c.</i> Third exception. M. Nicolas.....	41

	PAGE
$\alpha$ . Ewald's view .....	42
$\beta$ . Reuss' statement of the difficulty .....	42
$\gamma$ . M. Réville's addition .....	43
$\delta$ . Kuenen's theory .....	43
$\epsilon$ . Kuenen's view further developed .....	44
$\zeta$ . Kuenen's method illustrated .....	45
Answer: 1. The naturally ecstatic state .....	45
2. This is nowhere said to belong especially to the Hebrews .....	46
3. Fallacy of Kuenen's induction .....	47
4. The so-called natural facts have not yet been explained .....	47
5. Ecstasy is not the criterion of prophecy .....	48
6. Even one prophecy, established with certainty, is God's testimony .....	49
7. Falsely alleged unfulfilled prophecies .....	49
8. Philistia's destruction .....	50
9. No time determined in predictions .....	51
10. Prophecies concerning Israel .....	52
$\gamma$ . Relative truth of the prophecies .....	53
1. Organic connection of the prophecies .....	54
2. Identity of sacred and profane seer .....	54

## CHAPTER II.

## THE GENERAL DIFFUSION OF MESSIANIC PROPHECY.

1. General misery .....	56
<i>a</i> . Among the Egyptians and Indians .....	56
<i>b</i> . Among the Persians and Mexicans .....	57
<i>c</i> . Testimony of human sacrifices and other rites .....	57
<i>d</i> . The Greek sages .....	57
<i>e</i> . The later Greek writers .....	58
<i>f</i> . Greek philosophic thought .....	58
<i>g</i> . Testimony of Roman writers .....	59
2. General hope of redemption .....	60
<i>a</i> . The Persians .....	60
<i>b</i> . The Indians .....	61
<i>c</i> . The Chinese .....	64
<i>d</i> . The later Arabians and Persians .....	66
<i>e</i> . The Greeks .....	67
<i>f</i> . The Germanic races .....	68
<i>g</i> . The Celtic races .....	69
<i>h</i> . The Esthenians .....	70
<i>i</i> . The tribes of the Pacific islands .....	70
<i>k</i> . The Mexicans .....	71
<i>l</i> . The Peruvians .....	71
<i>m</i> . Domingo, the Algonquin, etc. ....	72
<i>n</i> . The Romans .....	73
<i>\alpha</i> . The Etruscan seers .....	73
<i>\beta</i> . The Sibylline sources .....	74
<i>\gamma</i> . Despair at non-fulfilment .....	75
<i>\delta</i> . Origin of Messianic prophecy .....	75

	PAGE
<i>a.</i> The Hebrews.....	76
<i>α.</i> To Solomon.....	76
<i>β.</i> Chronological summary.....	77
<i>γ.</i> From Solomon to Ezechias.....	78
<i>δ.</i> The prophets.....	79
<i>ε.</i> Result.....	79
<i>ζ.</i> Division of prophetical books.....	80
<i>η.</i> Chronology of the prophets.....	80
<i>θ.</i> Other prophets.....	81

### CHAPTER III.

#### NAME AND NATURE OF THE PROPHETS.

1. Verbal definition.....	82
<i>a.</i> Greek etymology.....	82
<i>b.</i> Hebrew etymology.....	83
<i>α.</i> Intransitive meaning.....	83
<i>β.</i> Passive meaning.....	84
<i>γ.</i> Active meaning.....	84
<i>c.</i> Use of the word.....	84
<i>α.</i> Nabi.....	84
<i>β.</i> Roeh and Chozeah.....	85
<i>γ.</i> Difference of use.....	86
<i>δ.</i> Other names of prophets.....	87
2. Definition from effects.....	87
<i>a.</i> In the New Testament.....	87
<i>b.</i> In the Old Testament.....	88
<i>α.</i> Prophetic authority extends to all Israelites.....	88
<i>β.</i> Embraces private matters.....	88
<i>γ.</i> Political affairs.....	89
<i>δ.</i> Religious questions.....	89
3. Definition from psychological condition of the prophet.....	90
<i>a.</i> Purely intellectual or sensible.....	91
<i>b.</i> Seven kinds of sensible prophecy.....	91
<i>α.</i> Words.....	92
<i>β.</i> Visions.....	92
1. Views of Philo, etc.....	93
2. This theory rejected.....	93
3. The prophets passive in their visions.....	94
<i>γ.</i> Dreams.....	94
<i>δ.</i> Ecstasy not excluded.....	95
<i>ε.</i> Prophetic certainty.....	96
4. Rationalistic theories.....	96
<i>a.</i> Briggs' theory.....	97
<i>b.</i> Riehm's theory.....	100
<i>c.</i> Verdict on Riehm's theory.....	103
<i>α.</i> It is based on a false principle.....	103
<i>β.</i> Its assumptions are gratuitous.....	104
<i>γ.</i> The process of development is merely natural.....	104
<i>δ.</i> The definiteness of the prophecies is not explained.....	105
<i>ε.</i> The idea of fulfilment is destroyed.....	105

## CHAPTER IV.

## THE PROPHETIC OFFICE.

	PAGE
1. The exercise of the prophetic office was extraordinary.....	107
2. The call to the prophetic office was extraordinary.....	107
<i>a.</i> The prophetic order and the prophetic gift are not convertible terms.....	108
<i>b.</i> Prophetic schools.....	108
<i>α.</i> Reasons for their existence.....	109
<i>β.</i> Reasons not convincing.....	109
<i>γ.</i> Schools involved in uncertainty.....	110
<i>δ.</i> Probable description of the schools.....	110
3. The prophetic office was an ordinary institution.....	111
<i>a.</i> The priests are not the ordinary teachers.....	111
<i>b.</i> Deut. xviii. 9-22.....	112
<i>α.</i> Reasons for applying the text to Christ alone.....	113
<i>β.</i> Its typical reference to Christ.....	114
<i>γ.</i> Its literal reference to the prophets.....	116
<i>c.</i> The prophets were the ordinary teachers.....	117
Exception answered.....	117
<i>d.</i> Prophetic influence in the state.....	118
<i>e.</i> Secondary functions of the prophets.....	119
4. Prophets and priests.....	119
<i>a.</i> They are distinct.....	120
<i>b.</i> Not opposed to each other.....	120
5. Prophets and kings.....	121
6. The prophets and the Pentateuch.....	122
<i>a.</i> Importance of this question.....	123
<i>b.</i> Smith's view.....	124
<i>c.</i> Influence on the historical books.....	124
<i>d.</i> Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers.....	127
<i>e.</i> Chronological order of sources.....	127
<i>f.</i> The Hexateuch a development of prophetic doctrine.....	128
<i>g.</i> The historical hypothesis is unsound.....	129
<i>α.</i> The composition is impossible.....	129
<i>β.</i> Language.....	130
<i>γ.</i> Style of the documents.....	131
<i>δ.</i> Alleged repetitions, contradictions, etc.....	131
<i>ε.</i> Historical argument.....	132
<i>ζ.</i> Osce's testimony.....	134
7. Theology of the prophets.....	135
<i>a.</i> View of God.....	135
<i>b.</i> Divine names.....	136
<i>c.</i> The "name of the Lord".....	137
<i>d.</i> Mystery of the Holy Trinity.....	137
<i>e.</i> Prophetic anthropomorphism.....	138
8. Anthropology of the prophets.....	139
<i>a.</i> General outline.....	139
<i>b.</i> Beginning and end.....	140
<i>c.</i> Sheol.....	142
Review.....	142

CHAPTER V.

THE WRITINGS OF THE PROPHETS.

	PAGE
1. The prophetic writings are inspired.....	144
2. Spoken and merely written prophecies.....	145
3. Abbreviated prophecies.....	145
4. Titles of the prophetic books.....	146
5. The prophetic style.....	147
6. Obscurity of the prophets.....	147
<i>a.</i> Reasons of obscurity.....	148
<i>α.</i> Confusion of tenses.....	149
<i>β.</i> Fragmentary character of predictions.....	150
<i>γ.</i> The idea of prophecy does not involve absolute clearness.....	150
<i>δ.</i> Absence of chronological perspective.....	151
<i>ε.</i> Chronological accuracy is not always wanting.....	152
<i>ζ.</i> Prophetic imagery.....	154
1. The typical sense.....	154
2. Allegorical types.....	155
3. Difference between symbols and types.....	156
4. How to recognize the typical meaning.....	157
5. The figurative sense.....	158

PART I.

THE GENEALOGY OF THE MESSIAS.

CHAPTER I.

THE MESSIAS IS THE SON OF GOD. Ps. ii.

Introduction. 1. Position of Ps. ii.....	161
2. Structure of Ps. ii.....	161
3. Author of the Psalm.....	162
4. Subject of the Psalm.....	163
Text and Commentary.....	167
Corollary : The Messiah is the Son of God.....	176
1. In the light of Christian revelation.....	176
2. In the light of the Old Testament.....	176
<i>A.</i> Rabbinic testimony for the Messianic character of Ps. ii.....	177
<i>B.</i> The Divine Sonship of the Messiah as taught in the Synagogue.....	179

CHAPTER II.

THE MESSIAS IS THE SEED OF THE WOMAN. Gen. iii, 1-19.

Introduction. 1. Mythical explanation.....	184
2. Symbolical explanation.....	184
3. Allegorical explanation.....	185
4. Messianic character of the passage.....	186
Text and Commentary.....	186

	PAGE
Corollary : The Messianic character of the passage.....	207
1. Christian testimony.....	207
2. Rabbinic testimony.....	207

## CHAPTER III.

THE MESSIAS IS THE SON OF SEM. Gen. ix. 18-27.

Introduction.....	212
Messianic character of the passage.....	212
Text and Commentary.....	215
Corollary: Prophetic Summary.....	220

## CHAPTER IV.

THE MESSIAS IS THE SON OF ABRAHAM, ISAAC, AND JACOB.

Gen. xii. 1-9; xvii. 1-9; xviii. 17-19; xxii. 16-18; xxvi. 1-5;  
xxviii. 10-15.

Introduction : 1. Time and place of the prophecies.....	221
2. Messianic character of the prophecies.....	226
Text and Commentary.....	227
Corollaries : 1. Patriarchal hope.....	234
2. Relation of the patriarchs to the prophecies.....	234

## CHAPTER V.

THE MESSIAS IS THE SON OF JACOB. Num. xxiv. 15-19.

Introduction : 1. Time and occasion of the prophecy.....	237
2. Character of the prophet.....	238
3. Authorship of the prophecy.....	239
4. Unchristian applications of the prophecy.....	239
5. Messianic character of Balaam's prophecy.....	240
Text and Commentary.....	244
Corollary: Prophetic Summary.....	247

## CHAPTER VI.

THE MESSIAS IS THE SON OF DAVID.

*Section I. The Son of David shall rule forever.* II. Kings vii. 1-16;  
I. Par. xvii. 1-17.

Introduction: 1. History of the prophecy.....	248
2. Authorship of the prophecy.....	248
3. Messianic character of the prophecy.....	250
Text and Commentary.....	252
Corollary: Prophetic Summary.....	255

*Section II. The Son of David is the Prince of Pastors.* Jer. xxiii.  
1-8; xxxiii. 14-26.

Introduction: 1. Connection of the prophecy with its context....	255
2. Jer. xxxiii. 14-26 is parallel to xxiii. 1-8.....	256
3. Subject of the prophecy.....	257
Text and Commentary.....	261

	PAGE
Corollaries: 1. The faithful pastor in the house of David.....	263
2. The divine nature of the Messiah .....	264
3. The priests, princes, and pastors in a moral sense.....	264
<i>Section III. The Messiah will spring from the marrow of the high cedar. Ezech. xvii.</i>	
Introduction: 1. Time and occasion of the prophecy.....	265
2. Division of the prophecy.....	266
3. The Messianic character of the passage.....	266
Text and Commentary.....	266
Corollary: Messianic character of Ezechiel's prophecy.....	269

## PART II.

### BIRTH OF THE MESSIAS.

#### CHAPTER I.

##### PLACE OF THE MESSIAS' BIRTH. Mich. v. 2-14.

Introduction: 1. Connection of the prophecy with the preceding ones.....	271
2. Antichristian explanation of Micheas' prophecy.....	273
3. Messianic character of the prophecy.....	274
Text and Commentary.....	275
Corollaries.....	280

#### CHAPTER II.

##### THE TIME OF THE MESSIAS' BIRTH.

##### *Section I. The Blessing of Juda. Gen. xlix. 8-12.*

Introduction: 1. Time and occasion of the prophecy .....	282
2. Place of the prophecy in the critical analysis of Genesis.....	283
3. Messianic character of the prophecy.....	284
Text and Commentary.....	288
Corollaries: 1. More definite meaning of the prophecy.....	295
2. Is the Messiah of the tribe of Juda ?.....	297
3. What could the Jews understand of this prophecy ?.....	297
4. Argument against the present Synagogue.....	298

##### *Section II. Daniel's Seventy Weeks. Dan. ix. 22-27.*

Introduction: 1. Time and occasion of the prophecy.....	299
2. Unchristian explanations of the prophecy.....	299
3. Messianic character of the prophecy.....	299
Text and Commentary.....	308
Corollaries: Chronological agreement between prophecy and fulfilment.....	316

##### *Section III. The Coming to the Temple. Agg. ii. 1-10.*

Introduction: 1. The historical connection of the prophecy with its context.....	323
--	-----

	PAGE
2. Division of the prophecy.....	323
3. Explanations of the prophecy.....	324
4. The Messianic nature of Aggeus' prophecy.....	326
Text and Commentary.....	328
Corollary: 1. The general commotion.....	330
2. The desired of the nations .....	331
3. The Messianic peace.....	331

## CHAPTER III.

## THE VIRGIN MOTHER. Is. vii. 1-17.

Introduction: 1. History and occasion of the prophecy.....	333
2. Erroneous explanations of the prophecy.....	334
3. Messianic nature of the prophecy.....	335
Text and Commentary.....	341
Corollaries: 1. For Christians.....	356
2. For Rationalists .....	356
3. For Jews.....	356

## CHAPTER IV.

## THE PRECURSOR OF THE MESSIAS.

*Section I. The Voice in the Desert.* Is. xl. 1-11.

Introduction: 1. Connection of the prophecy with the prophetic series of Isaias.....	358
2. The Messianic character of the prophecy.....	359
3. The tropological sense of the passage.....	360
Text and Commentary.....	360
Corollary.....	363

*Section II. Elias the Prophet.* Mal. iv. 5, 6.

Introduction: 1. Connection of the prophecy with its context.....	363
2. Messianic character of the prophecy.....	363
3. The Second Advent.....	365
Text and Commentary.....	366
Corollary .....	367

## PART III.

## THE INFANCY OF THE MESSIAS.

## CHAPTER I.

## ADORATION OF THE MAGI. Ps. lxxi. 1-17.

Introduction: 1. Structure of the Psalm.....	369
2. Author of the Psalm.....	369
3. Subject of the Psalm.....	370
Text and Commentary.....	373
Corollary.....	376



## CONTENTS.

11

### CHAPTER II.

THE SLAUGHTER OF THE HOLY INNOCENTS. Jer. xxxi. 15-26.

	PAGE
Introduction: 1. Connection of the prophecy with its context.....	378
2. Time of the prophecy.....	379
3. Explanations of Rachel's weeping in Rama.....	379
4. Messianic character of the prophecy.....	381
Text and Commentary .....	381
Corollaries: 1. The literal and the typical sense of the prophecy.	384
2. The extraordinary manner of Christ's conception.....	385

### CHAPTER III.

THE FLIGHT INTO EGYPT. Os. xi. 1-7.

Introduction: 1. Connection of the prophecy with its context.....	386
2. Messianic character of the prophecy.....	386
Text and Commentary... ..	387
Corollary.....	388

---

## PART IV.

### *THE MESSIANIC NAMES.*

#### CHAPTER I.

THE MESSIAS IS THE ORIENT. Zach. iii.; vi. 9-15.

Introduction: 1. Connection of the prophecies with their context	389
2. Messianic character of the prophecies.....	390
Text and Commentary.....	393
Corollary.....	397

#### CHAPTER II.

THE MESSIAS IS THE SON OF MAN. Dan. vii.

Introduction: 1. Division of the prophecy.....	398
2. The time of the prophecy.....	398
3. Authenticity of the prophecy.....	403
4. The prophecy of Daniel has not been taken from Babylonian sources.....	406
5. Messianic character of Daniel's prophecy.....	408
Text and Commentary.....	411
Corollary: The Son of Man.....	425

#### CHAPTER III.

THE MESSIAS IS THE SAVIOUR. Is. li. 1-lii. 12; lxii.

Introduction: 1. Connection of the prophecies with the context.	428
---	-----

	PAGE
2. The Messianic character of these passages.....	428
Text and Commentary.....	430
Corollary.....	434

## CHAPTER IV.

## THE MESSIAS WILL BE THE ANGEL OF THE TESTAMENT.

Mal. ii. 17-iii. 6.

Introduction: The Messianic character of the prophecy.....	435
1. The phrase "My Angel" denotes John the Baptist.....	435
2. The Lord is Jehovah himself.....	436
3. The Angel of the Testament is the Messiah.....	437
Text and Commentary.....	438
Corollaries: 1. The divinity of the Messiah.....	440
2. His coming to the temple and his purifying the Levites....	440
3. An argument against the Jews.....	440
4, 5. The Eucharistic sacrifice and the two advents.....	440

## CHAPTER V.

## THE MESSIAS IS THE SERVANT OF THE LORD. Is. xlix. 1.

Introduction: 1. Identity of Jehovah's servant.....	442
2. Messianic character of the servant of the Lord....	443
3. Antichristian explanations.....	444
Text and Commentary.....	445
Corollary.....	448

## CHAPTER VI.

## THE MESSIAS WILL BE THE EMMANUEL. Is. viii. 1-10.

Introduction: 1. Connection of the prophecy with its context....	449
2. Erroneous explanations.....	449
3. Messianic character of the prophecy.....	450
Text and Commentary.....	450
Corollaries: 1. The land of Emmanuel.....	452
2. Juda's salvation through Emmanuel.....	452

## CHAPTER VII.

## THE MESSIAS IS THE PRINCE OF PEACE. Is. ix. 1-7.

Introduction: 1. Connection of the prophecy with its context....	453
2. Unchristian explanation of the prophecy.....	453
3. Messianic character of the prophecy.....	453
Text and Commentary.....	457
Corollary.....	458

## APPENDIX.

Rabbinic literature.....	459
--------------------------	-----

# CHRIST IN TYPE AND PROPHECY.

---

## INTRODUCTION.

---

### CHAPTER I.

#### HISTORY AND FORM OF THE PROPHECY-ARGUMENT.

A WILL may be contested on the plea of defective formality in the written document or of the testator's incompetency to dispose of his property in the particular manner indicated in the testament. In the contest about the validity of God's will and testament, now carried on with such earnestness and even bitterness, the plea of incompetence cannot claim the slightest weight of probability. All that the tribunal of reason can investigate is the signature with which God has signed his covenant. This divine seal attesting the reality of God's promises is composed of miracles and prophecies. Though the latter are only a species of the former, we must for the present limit our investigation to this narrower sphere, studying first the nature and properties of prophecy in general, and then comparing meaning with fulfilment of the particular Messianic predictions.

**1. HISTORY OF THE PROPHECY-ARGUMENT:** *a.* Jesus uses it.—Before beginning our research proper, it is of the highest

importance to review briefly what may be called the history of the Christian argument from prophecy, and to state its strict dialectic form. We cannot do better than open the historic outline of the prophetic argument with the words of Jesus addressed to his enemies : " Search the scriptures, for you think in them to have life everlasting: and the same are they that give testimony of me " (Jo. v. 39). On another occasion Jesus again appealed to the prophets : " It is written in the prophets : and they shall all be taught of God. Every one that hath heard of the Father, and hath learned, cometh to me " (Jo. vi. 45). And to show us that this argument is intended not only to confound the enemies of revelation, but also to strengthen the faith of believers, Jesus speaks to the two disciples on the way to Emmaus : " O foolish and slow of heart to believe in all things which the prophets have spoken ! Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and so to enter into his glory ? And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded to them in all the scriptures the things that were concerning him " (Luke xxiv. 25-27).

**b. The Apostles use the Argument.**—The apostles were not slow to learn the use they might make of the prophetic writings. St. Peter, addressing his brethren after Jesus' ascension into heaven, speaks as follows : " Men brethren, the scriptures must needs be fulfilled which the Holy Ghost spoke before by the mouth of David concerning Judas, who was the leader of them that apprehended Jesus . . . " (Acts i. 16). A few days later, on the feast of Pentecost, the same apostle speaks to the assembled multitude : " This is that which was spoken of by the prophet Joel : And it shall come to pass, in the last days (saith the Lord) I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams . . . " (Acts ii. 16 f.). On the same occasion the prince of the apostles appeals to a Messianic prophecy as a proof of Jesus' resurrection from the dead: " David saith concerning him: I

foresaw the Lord before my face always, because he is at my right hand that I may not be moved; for this my heart hath been glad, and my tongue hath rejoiced: moreover my flesh also shall rest in hope, because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, nor suffer thy Holy One to see corruption" (Acts ii. 25-27). And when Peter and John had healed the lame man at the Beautiful Gate, Peter again appealed to the prophecies in order to convince his numerous audience that the Christ must suffer: "Those things which God before had showed by the mouth of all the prophets that his Christ should suffer, he hath fulfilled" (Acts iii. 18). In the course of his discourse the same apostle appeals to Moses' prophecy as a proof that Jesus is the Christ: "For Moses said: A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me: him you shall hear according to all things whatsoever he shall speak to you. And it shall be that every soul which will not hear the prophet shall be destroyed from among the people. And all the prophets from Samuel and afterwards, who have spoken, have told of these days" (Acts iii. 22-24). This practice St. Peter must have continued throughout his apostolical life. In his second epistle (i. 19) he insists again on the argument derived from prophecy: "And we have the more firm prophetic word, whereunto you do well to attend, as to a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in your hearts." Here the prince of the apostles exhorts us to be guided by the light of prophecy even to that time when the light of glory shall be our lamp.

**c. The Evangelists use it.**—The prophetic argument is so often urged in the Gospel according to St. Matthew that we can here only indicate some of the principal references without stating either prophecy or fulfilment fully. Compare Mat. i. 23 and Is. vii. 14; Mat. ii. 6 and Mich. v. 2; Mat. ii. 15 and Os. xi. 1; Mat. ii. 18 and Jer. xxxi. 15; Mat. iii. 3 and Is. xl. 3; Mat. iv. 15 and Is. ix. 1; Mat. viii. 17 and Is. liii. 4; Mat. xi. 5 and Is. xxxv. 5; Mat. xi. 5 and

Is. lxi. 1; Mat. xi. 10 and Mal. iii. 1; Mat. xi. 14 and Mal. iv. 5; Mat. xii. 17 f. and Is. xlii. 1; Mat. xii. 39 and Jon. ii. 1; Mat. xiii. 14 and Is. vi. 9; Mat. xiii. 35 and Ps. lxxvii. (lxxviii.) 2; Mat. xv. 30 and Is. xxxv. 5; Mat. xvi. 4 and Jon. ii. 1; Mat. xxi. 13 and Is. lvi. 7; Mat. xxiv. 15 and Dan. ix. 27; Mat. xxvi. 24 and Ps. xl. (xli.) 10; Mat. xxvi. 31 and Zach. xiii. 7; Mat. xxvi. 54 and Is. liii. 10; Mat. xxvi. 56 and Lam. iv. 20; Mat. xxvii. 9 and Zach. xi. 12; Mat. xxvii. 35 and Ps. xxi. 19. The prophecies of *Isaías* are cited between fifty and sixty times in the New Testament, and the *Psalms* are quoted not less than seventy times, and very frequently as being predictive. *Ezechiel*, *Abdias*, *Nahum*, and *Sophonias* seem not to be directly appealed to in the New Testament writings; but it must be remembered that the "Prophets" are often spoken of together (Mat. ii. 23; Acts xiii. 40, xv. 15) as being authoritative.

*d. The Patristic Use of the Argument.*—Still when we keep in mind that the argument from prophecy is one of the mainstays in the apology for revelation, it may surprise us at first sight that it is employed so rarely in the New Testament. But the references to the Old Testament prophecies are so scarce in the New Testament not from any special design, but because the occasions for their use were so few. In point of fact, some Messianic prophecies of the greatest import have been entirely omitted in the New Testament, e.g., Is. ix. 5, 6; Jer. xxiii. 5, 6; Zach. vi. 12, 13. The epistle of *Barnabas* (71–120 A.D.) and *Justin's* dialogue against *Trypho* (d. about 163 A.D.) begin a more extensive and systematic discussion of the Messianic predictions. *Justin's* work may be called a missionary production, and the author is in so far inferior to his opponent as he is acquainted with the Old Testament only through the secondary source of the Septuagint. *Origen* (d. 254 A.D.) was in this respect better equipped to meet (in his eighth book) *Celsus* (about 247 A.D.) on the heathen and the Jewish misrepresentations of the person of Christ. But his work

suffered from the arbitrary allegorization in which the Alexandrian school imitated Philo. The historical interpretation of the Antiochian school brought about a reaction, and Theodore of Antioch, bishop of Mopsuestia, transgressed in this way the lines of prudence and even of truth (d. 428 A.D.).

**e. The progressive Development of Messianic Prophecy.**—The preparation for the Christian redemption through a progressive and connected history in the Old Testament seems not to have been noticed till the time of the middle ages. The patristic writers appeal to single prophecies or state in general terms that the prophetic argument for Christianity is a powerful one; but they do not perceive the full historic perspective of the Messianic predictions (cf. Chrysost., in Jo. hom. xix. n. 2, t. lix. col. 121; hom. li. n. 1, col. 283–284; August., de Civ. Dei, l. xviii. c. 41, n. 3, t. xli. col. 602). With Cocceius (d. 1669) began the method of treating the Old Testament in periods. It is to Catholic writers that we owe the first deeper insight into prophecy. Pascal (*Pensées*, éd. Molinier, t. ii. p. 11), Bossuet (*Discours sur l'histoire universelle; lettres sur le "shilo,"* cf. *Analecta juris pontificii*, 1876, col. 1011 sqq.), and Huet (*Démonstration évangélique*, Paris 1679) have given clear proof of their thorough appreciation of prophecy. Spener and his school greatly advanced the same study. They were followed in their endeavors by Abadie (*Accomplissement des prophéties en Jesus-Christ*, La Haye 1689), Camphausen, S.J. (*Passio Jesu Christi adumbrata in figuris et prophetiis antiquæ legis a SS. PP. et Scripturæ sacræ interpretibus explicata*, Coloniis, 1704), Clarke (*Connexion of Prophecies in the Old Testament and Application to Christ*, London, 1725), Kidder (*Demonstration of the Messiah*, London, 1726), John Gill (*The Prophecies of the Old Testament Literally Fulfilled in Jesus*, London, 1728), Gillies (*Essays on the Prophecies relating to the Messiah*, Edinburgh, 1773), Maclaurin (*Essay on the Prophecies relating to the Messiah*, London, 1778), Hales (*Dissertations on*



the Principal Prophecies, 2d ed., London, 1802), and Robinson (Prophecies on the Messiah, London, 1812). Meanwhile Schoettgen's *Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ* (vol. ii. de Messia, 1742) had appeared, a work of so eminent scholarship that it scarcely stands in need of any further commendation. Its only defect, if defect it can be called, consists in making Christian theologians out of Jewish rabbis.

*f. Why the Argument was Treated so frequently: α. IN ENGLAND.*—It is not surprising that about this period so many treatises on the Prophecies were written; for the supernatural character of Christianity had been attacked on all sides and in all countries. Grotius (1583–1646) and Spinoza (1632–1677) had prepared the way for rationalism by corrupting the genuine idea of scriptural inspiration. Pereyrius, too, minimized the supernatural element in Christianity by reducing the miracles to the smallest possible number (1594–1676). In England it was under the fair name of Deism that Christianity was attacked. Herbert Cherbury (*De veritate prout distinguitur a revelatione, a verisimili, a falso*, 1629), John Toland (*Christianity Not Mysterious*), Tindal (*Christianity as Old as Creation*, 1740), Woolston (*On the Miracles of Christ*), Collins (*On Free Thought*), Bolingbroke, Chubb, Whiston, Shaftesbury, Whittey, Somers, Wharton, Shrewsbury, and Buckingham are some of the principal apostles of Deism. It is true that on the other hand appeared several direct refutations of the above works and writers. Locke (*Reasonable Christianity*, 1695), Kortholt (*De tribus impostoribus magnis liber*, Eduardo Herbert, Thomæ Hobbesio, et Benedicto Spinosæ oppositus, 1680), Browne (*Refutation of Toland's Christianity Not Mysterious*, 1696), James Foster (*Defence of the Usefulness, etc., of the Christian religion against Tindal*, 1731), John Conybeare (*Defence of Revealed Religion, in answer to Christianity as Old as Creation*, 1732), and Leland (*A View of the Principal Deistical Writers that have appeared in England in the Last and Present Century*, 3 vols., 1754–1756), uphold the supernatural character of



Christianity. But it is to be regretted that some of these apologetic works have done more harm than good to their cause.

β. IN FRANCE.—In 1726 Voltaire had to take refuge in England, where he lived for nearly two years in the society of the “Freethinkers.” Here he was thoroughly imbued with the writings and the views of Bolingbroke, so that his own works after his return to France in 1728 took the same tone. It is worthy of notice that Voltaire took his difficulties against the inspired writings and against revealed truth in general from the classical commentaries of Calmet. This method of copying the learned scholar’s objections without so much as mentioning their solution, or even the source from which they had been taken, is truly worthy of the parent of the French Encyclopædists.

γ. IN GERMANY.—Strauss remarks that in the battle against supernatural religion England has prepared the arms, France has taught the world how to use them, and Germany has been the first to attack the orthodox citadel of Sion. The Wolfian philosophy may be said to have prepared the way for the direct attack by freeing the human mind from the strict letter of the Bible (about the middle of the eighteenth century). Laur. Schmidt (*Bibel von Wertheim*, 1735) went so far as to translate the Pentateuch into the language of the Wolfian philosophy. The critical Bible editions of Wetstein (1751) and Griesbach (1779) began to shake men’s confidence in the inspired text. Edelmann (1746) was an advocate of pantheism, and placed the origin of the New Testament in the time of Constantine the Great. Barlhd̄t (1784) makes Jesus the tool or the ruler of a secret society. Nicolai indirectly propagates rationalism in his “*Bibliotheca Germanica Universa*” (1765–1792); and in his “*Life and Opinions of Master Sebaldus Nothanker*” he proposes a model parson, who teaches his congregation when to rise in the morning, how to take care of their health, how to keep their tools, how to cultivate their fields, and other matters of practical importance.

About this time things had come to such a pass that few ministers were willing or able to explain the Gospel to the faithful. *John Albert Bengel* (d. 1752) and *Christian Augustus Crusius* (d. 1775) had modified the idea of inspiration, no longer regarding the prophets as merely passive, but also as active instruments of the divine spirit. But the climax was reached when *Lessing* began to publish the "Fragments of Wolfenbüttel," the work of his deceased friend, *Samuel Reimarus* (d. 1768), author of the "Apology for the Reasonable Worshippers of God." In the "Fragments of an Unknown" (1774) tolerance for the Deists is inculcated; in the following publication (1777) revelation in general is attacked, and it is shown especially that there is no religion in the Old Testament; finally, the third part of the fragments is directed against Jesus and his apostles (1778), contending that Jesus mainly intended to restore the theocracy; that John the Baptist was his accomplice; that the Temple was violated on the first Palm Sunday; that Jesus died amid loud complaints and moanings, and that the apostles feigned the resurrection. The founders of the Christian religion are thus represented as so many deceivers.

δ. IN GERMANY, *continued*.—The first opponent of Lessing was *Götze*. His apology for Christianity excited, however, more amusement than conviction. The inspiration of scripture, he thought, must be denied, all miracles rejected. *Semler* (Dec. 18, 1725—March 14, 1791) was a more logical writer. Still, explaining the life of Jesus as a mere accommodation to the surrounding circumstances he may, perhaps, defend Jesus against the charge of wilful deceit, but cannot grant him a higher position than that of a teacher of religion and morality. *Paulus* (Sept. 1, 1761—Aug. 10, 1851) went a step farther. In his *Leben Jesu* (1828) he explains the miraculous in the gospels as resulting from the subjective impressions of the evangelists. Illustrating his view, he appeals to the different impression produced on three different observers by the same natural

phenomenon,—e.g., the Cartesian diver. The physicist sees in it the application of a general natural law, the educated man admires it as a wonder of nature, but the simple workingman feels like reverencing the same fact as a miracle transcending all the powers of nature. The apostles and evangelists were similarly impressed by Jesus' words and works. Here, again, Christ's divine character is sacrificed for the sake of a scientific hypothesis. Thus far the would-be apologists of Christian revelation have tried to guard the historical character of the gospels. *Strauss* (Jan. 27, 1808—Feb. 9, 1871) did not leave even the historical character of truthfulness to the gospel-records. In his "*Leben Jesu*" (1835, 1864, 1874) the life of Christ is explained as a gathering of pious myths, even as there are mythical personages in nearly every nation and literature. We hardly need to add *Baur's* system (Sept. 6, 1809—April 13, 1882), according to which the New Testament records are the expressions of two different ecclesiastical parties, the Petrine and the Pauline, and of a third party endeavoring to reconcile the two.

ε. THE RATIONALISTS' HISTORICAL METHOD.—It is natural that, in the history of the prophetic interpretation, we should have touched on the literature of the life of Christ. For, since type and antitype, prediction and fulfilment, are essentially correlative terms, the view taken of the one necessarily influences the interpretation of the other. Consequently, we find a series of writers who carry out the rationalistic view of prophecy according to a historical method. As representatives of this school we may mention *Stuehelin* (*Messianische Weissagungen*, Berlin, 1847), *Anger* (Posthumous lectures "*Über die Geschichte der Messianischen Idee*," edited by Krenkel, Berlin, 1873), *Hitzig* (d. 1875 ; "*Vorlesungen über biblische Theologie und Messianische Weissagung des Alten Testaments*," edited by Kneucher, Karlsruhe, 1880), and above all *Kuenen* (*The Prophets and Prophecy in Israel*, London, 1877). The latter dismisses, on principle, all that is supernatural, and

regards ethical monotheism as the kernel and the soul of all prophecy. *Duhm* (*Theologie der Propheten*, Bonn, 1875) starts with the hypothesis that the Old Testament literary prophets belong to an earlier age than the Mosaic Law, and that in the writing of every prophet there is a special system of teaching by means of which he hinders or helps the progress to greater freedom in religious matters. *Duhm* thus combines *Wellhausen's* theory of the Old Testament literature with *Baur's* typical principle applied in the New Testament.

ξ. CHRISTIAN APOLOGIES.—*Hengstenberg's* (d. 1869) "Christologie des Alten Testaments" (Berlin, 1829-1835, 3 vols.; 2d ed. 1854-1857) formed a new epoch in the treatment of the Messianic prophecies from a Christian point of view. *Cunningham* in his "Remarks" had defended the Christian standpoint against the Jewish view set forth in *David Levi's* "Dissertations on the Prophecies in the Old Testament" (1793-1796, London; cf. *Salvador*, *Histoire des institutions de Moïse et du peuple hébreu*, Paris, 1828). But *Hengstenberg* defended Christianity against the latest attacks of critical rationalism. *Hofmann's* (d. 1877) work entitled "Weissagung und Erfüllung" (Nördlingen, 1841-1844, in two parts) is a proper companion piece to *Hengstenberg's* Christology. The work reconstructs the entire Old Testament account historically and exegetically as an organic whole. *Bertheau* in his lengthy article "Die alttestamentliche Weissagung von Israel's Reichsherrlichkeit in seinem Lande" (*Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, vol. iv., Gotha, 1859) endeavors to separate the present idea of the fulfilment from the particular national form. *Hilgenfeld* (*Die Jüdische Apokalyptik in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, 1857) reviews the development of the Messianic idea among the Jewish people. *Reinke's* "Messianische Weissagungen bei den grossen und kleinen Propheten des alten Testaments" (Münster, 1859) is a classical Catholic treatise on the subject. *Meignan's* "Les prophéties messianiques de l'Ancien

Testament" (Paris, 1856), *de la Luzerne's* "Dissertations sur les Prophéties," *de Pompignan's* "l'Incrédulité convaincue par les Prophéties," *Jacquelot's* "Traite de la vérité et de l'inspiration de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament" deserve careful attention.

7. LESS CONSERVATIVE APOLOGIES.—*Tholuck* (d. 1877), in his "Propheten und ihre Weissagungen" (Gotha, 1860), and *Gustav Baur* in his "Geschichte der alt testamentlichen Weissagung" (Theil 1, 1861), follow Hengstenberg, only in a spirit of freer criticism. *Öhler* (d. 1872) in his articles "Messias" and "Weissagung" (Herzog's R. E., 1st ed., vol. ix. Stuttgart, 1858; vol. xvii. Gotha, 1863), and in his posthumous "Theology of the Old Testament" (1st ed., Tübingen 1873-1874; 2d ed., 1882-1885), has tried a compromise between conservatism and headlong rationalism. *Diestel's* "Geschichte des alten Testaments in der christlichen Kirche" (Jena, 1869), *Küper's* "Das Prophetenthum des alten Bundes übersichtlich dargestellt" (Leipzig, 1870), and *Castelli's* "Il Messia secondo gli Ebrei" (Florence, 1784), must be mentioned at this period. *Richm* (d. 1888), in his work "Die Messianische Weissagung" (Gotha, 1875; English translation by L. A. Muirhead, Edinburgh, 1891), inquires into the origin, the historical character, and the fulfilment of prophecy, but fails to do justice to the literal meaning of the several predictions. *Drummond* (The Jewish Messiah, 1877) is still perhaps the main English authority on his own view of this subject; *Gloag* (The Messianic Prophecies, Baird Lecture for 1879), deserves a careful reading. *Eduard König's* work, "Der Offenbarungsbegriff des alten Testaments" (Leipzig, 1882), defends the supernatural character of the Old Testament prophecy. We must not omit *A. Edersheim's* reprint of his Warburton Lectures for the years 1880-1884, which he collected in a volume entitled "Prophecy and History in Relation to the Messiah" (New York, 1885). Here is the place to mention *Orelli's* Old Testament Prophecy of the Consummation of God's King-

dom (Clark's translation), *Stanton's* "The Jewish and Christian Messiah, a study in the earliest history of Christianity," *Scott's* "Historical Development of the Messianic Idea" (Old Testament Student, 1888, 176-180), and *Reinhard's* "Der Welterlöser im alten Testament" (1888). *Brigg's* "Messianic Prophecy" aims at complete exegetical treatment of Messianic passages (Edinburgh and New York, 1886). *C. Elliott's* "Old Testament Prophecy" (New York, 1889) professes to explain the nature of prophecy, its organic connection with Old Testament history, and its New Testament fulfilment. *Delitzsch* published his "Messianische Weissagungen in geschichtlicher Folge" at Leipzig (Faber, 1890); the work is translated into English by Prof. Curtis (New York, 1891). *Baldensperger's* "Selbstbewusstsein Jesu im Lichte der Messianischen Hoffnungen seiner Zeit" (Strassburg, 1888; 2d ed., Strassburg, 1892) deserves also a careful study, though, like most works of Protestant authors, it is tainted with several rationalistic ideas.

9. WORKS WHICH DEAL PARTIALLY WITH THE PROPHECIES.—We might extend this list of authors indefinitely were we to enumerate all the works which deal in part with our subject, or with some aspect of it. Still, a few must be noticed here on account of their importance and the frequent use we shall have to make of them. Such are: *Düsterwald's* "Die Weltreiche und das Gottesreich nach den Weissagungen des Propheten Daniel" (Freiburg, 1890); *Edersheim's* "The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah," book ii., c. v.; *Schürer's* "Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu" (Engl. transl. Edinburgh, 1890); and *Keim's* "Life of Jesus of Nazara" (Engl. transl. vol. i. pp. 314-327; vol. iv. pp. 256-343; vol. vi. pp. 384 to end). Nearly complete bibliographical lists will be found in several of the works already referred to.

2. DIALECTIC FORM OF THE PROPHECY ARGUMENT.—Thus far we have considered the history of the Christian argument from prophecy; we must next state the argument itself



in its strict dialectic form. It may be worded as follows: God cannot testify to what is false. But God has by means of the Messianic prophecies testified to the divinity and the divine mission of Jesus. Consequently Jesus had a divine mission and nature (*Diction. de la théolog. cath. de Wetzer et Welte, trad. franc. de Goschler. t. xix. pp. 201 ff.; Perrone, Prælect. theologicæ, éd. Migne, t. i. col. 74 f.*).

Without insisting for the present on the further conclusion that the Christian religion and revelation are of a divine origin and necessarily truthful, we turn our attention to the force of the argument itself. If the premises are correct, the conclusion follows beyond all reasonable doubt. The first two statements then deserve a more minute examination.

**α. Major Premise.**—In the first, or the major, premise our attention is drawn to the conditions which are necessarily presupposed in the prophecy argument. The existence of God, his essential attributes, and the first principles of morality are supposed to be known by the light of reason. A number of recent writers have stated this fact very clearly and forcibly. *Mill* says in his *Logic* (ii. p. 168): “If we do not already believe in supernatural agencies, no miracle can prove to us their existence. The miracle itself, considered merely as an extraordinary fact, may be satisfactorily certified by our senses or by testimony, but nothing can ever prove that it is a miracle; there is still another possible hypothesis—that of its being the result of some unknown natural cause; and this possibility cannot be so completely shut out as to leave no alternative but that of admitting the existence and intervention of a being superior to nature.” *Paley*, in his *Introduction to the “Evidences,”* uses the following expression: “The effect we ascribe simply to the volition of the Deity, of whose existence and power, not to say of whose presence and agency, we have previous and independent proof. . . . In a word, once believe that there is a God, and miracles are not incredible.” *Mozley* again and again repeats this same truth in his

Lectures on Miracles: "Unless a man brings the belief in God to a miracle," he says in the fifth lecture, "he does not get it from the miracle." *Prof. W. Lee*, in his *Essay on Miracles*, substantially agrees with the above authors: "The Christian argument for miracles takes for granted two elementary truths—the omnipotence and the personality of God." The *Rev. L. Davies*, in his "Signs of the Kingdom of Heaven" (p. 35) maintains: "The miracle of miracles must be the existence of a living God. If we do not believe this, it is impossible that any smaller miracles should prove it to us." We may conclude with the words of *Westcott*, taken from his *Gospel of the Resurrection* (p. 45): "For physical students as such, and for those who take their impressions of the universe solely from them, miracles can have no real existence."

It must be kept in mind all through that we do not mean to say that God's existence might not be proved from a miraculous fact, viewed as a contingent or as a changeable being; but we merely contend that the recognition of a miracle as such presupposes the acknowledgment of a personal God. And the existence of God once granted, it is easily shown that he cannot testify to a falsehood.

**b. Minor Premise.**—The second or minor premise of our prophecy-argument calls for a more lengthy explanation. It maintains that God by means of the Messianic prophecies has testified to the divinity and the divine mission of Jesus. Three distinct statements are evidently contained in this sentence: (1) There have been real Messianic predictions; (2) these Messianic predictions are true prophecies; (3) they were employed by God in confirmation of Jesus's divine mission and nature.

**a. HISTORICAL TRUTH OF THE PROPHECIES.**—The main difficulties urged against the existence of real Messianic predictions may be reduced to two heads: (a) Christians may have read into the Old Testament predictions which were not really contained in it; (b) Christians may have inserted into the life of Christ fulfilments which have no



existence in history. The second exception is equivalent to a denial of the authenticity and truthfulness of the gospel records, facts proved in the introduction to the New Testament canon. Additional data for answering the difficulty will be found among the apocalyptic and the Rabbinic productions, which we shall have to refer to in answering the first exception.

1. *The Old Testament Books precede the New Testament.*—Supposing then the New Testament canon established, and therefore the facts of Christ's life proved, we must show that the Old Testament prophecies of the Messiah cannot be Christian fiction. This will appear in the first place all through the course of Messianic prophecies, since they will be recognized as genuine part and parcel of the several Old Testament books, whose canonicity is proved beyond all reasonable doubt. For even supposing that the date of some parts of the Old Testament is much more recent than has been believed, a supposition which we make only for argument's sake, it is still certain that the literature in question originated before the birth of Christ, so that our statement regarding the existence of Messianic predictions remains in force.

2. *Sibylline Oracles.*—But since it is considered incumbent on the scientific theologian of our day to prove his thesis not merely from scriptural but also from profane sources, if such a proof is possible, we too shall indicate certain early books and writings, though partly fragmentary, which bear evidence to the existence of Messianic predictions before and at the time of the birth of Jesus. Here belongs, in the first place, the greatest part of the third book (v. 97-807) of the Sibylline oracles, because after Bleek's time most critics maintain that they have been written by a Greek-Alexandrian Jew, and constitute the most ancient part of the whole collection. Reuss (Herzog's R. E. p. 184 ff., article *Sibyllen*) and Hilgenfeld contend that they were written about 137, and others place them later still. But for our purpose the exact year of their

composition is a matter of indifference. It must be noted that the value of this source is somewhat lessened, because it is not universally admitted that before the time of Christ the Alexandrian schools exercised a great influence on the Palestinian.

3. *Book of Enoch*.—Of the greatest importance in the present question is the Book of Enoch. It purports to have been written by the patriarch Enoch, and is quoted in the Epistle of Jude (14, 15). Though several Fathers use it as the genuine production of its reputed author, and as containing authentic divine revelations, it has never been recognized by the Church as canonical (cf. article *Enoch* in Smith's Bible Dictionary). The Byzantine chronicler George Syncellus (about 800 A.D.) still quotes two long passages from the book; after that period it is lost sight of, till in the course of the last century the discovery was made that an Ethiopic version was extant in the Abyssinian Church. In the year 1773, Bruce, the Scottish traveller, brought three manuscripts of it to Europe. But it was not till the year 1821 that the whole work was given to the world through the English translation of Laurence. A German translation was made by Hofmann, which from chapter i. to lv. is based upon the English version of Laurence (1833), and from chapter lvi. to the end on the Ethiopic version collated with a new manuscript (1838). The Ethiopic text was published by Laurence in 1838, and subsequently by Dillmann in 1851; the latter has been collated with five manuscripts. Dillmann also issued a new German translation in 1853 with emendations so important that all disquisitions connected with the Book of Enoch have been based on it. The hope that new light would be thrown on the subject by a small Greek fragment (lxxxix. 42-49) published in facsimile by Card. Mai from a Cod. Vatic. (cod. gr. 1809) and deciphered by Gildmeister, was doomed to disappointment, since the Codex contained nothing more of the Book of Enoch. New Greek Enoch fragments were discovered in the winter of 1886-87, in the Christian burial

city of Akhmim, in Upper Egypt. They were published in the *Mémoires publiés par les membres de la mission archéologique française au Caire sous la direction de M. N. Bouriant* (tome ix<sup>me</sup> I<sup>er</sup> fascicule; Paris, Ernest Leroux, 1892; II. 147, lexicon size).

*a. Division of the Book of Enoch.*—The book may be divided into the following parts: 1. Chapters i.–v. contain the introduction to the whole. 2. Chapters vi.–xi. give an account of the fall of the angels. 3. Chapters xii.–xvi. tell how Enoch is commissioned to announce to the angels the coming judgment. 4. Chapters xvii.–xxxvi. describe how Enoch is carried over mountains, seas, and rivers, and how he was shown the mysteries of nature, the ends of the earth, the place of the fallen spirits, the dwellings of the departed souls, both just and unjust, the tree of life, etc. 5. Chapters xxxvii.–lxxi. contain three allegories. *a.* The first allegory, embracing chapters xxxvii.–xliv., describes Enoch's vision of the abode of the righteous and the saints; Enoch also sees the myriads of spirits standing before the throne of the Most High, the four angels Michael, Raphael, Gabriel and Phanuel, the receptacles wherein the sun, the moon, and the winds are kept, the lightning and the stars of heaven, all of which have their own special name. *b.* In the second allegory, containing chapters xlv.–lvii., Enoch is informed regarding the "Chosen One," "the Son of Man"—i.e., the Messiah. The patriarch learns the Messiah's nature and mission, and how he is to judge the world and establish his kingdom. *c.* The third allegory, consisting of chapters lviii.–lxix., treats of the blessedness of the righteous and the just, of the mysteries of thunder and lightning, of the day on which the "Chosen One," "the Son of Man," shall judge the world. *d.* Chapters lxx. and lxxi. contain the conclusion of the three allegories. 6. Chapters lxxii.–lxxxii. form the astronomical book, giving us all the astronomical information Enoch had obtained from the angel Uriel. 7. Chapters lxxxiii.–xc. contain two visions: *a.* Chapters lxxxiii. and lxxxiv. describe the vision

of the flood, where Enoch prays God not to destroy the whole human family. 6. Chapters lxxxv.–xc. narrate the vision of the cattle, sheep, wild beasts, and shepherds, symbolizing the whole history of Israel down to the Messianic times. 8. In chapter xci. Enoch exhorts his children to lead a pious life. 9. Chapter xcii. forms the introduction to the next section. 10. In chapters xciii. and xciv. 12–17 Enoch enlightens us concerning the world-weeks. 11. Chapters xciv.–cv. contain woes against the wicked and the ungodly, and hold out joyful expectations to the just. 12. Chapters cvi. and cvii. describe the birth of Noe and predict the flood. 13. Chapter cviii. informs us regarding the fire of hell, to which the souls of the wicked and the blaspheming are consigned.

*b. Author of the Book of Enoch.*—A few words must be added about the author of the book of Enoch and the probable time of its composition. 1. J. C. K. von Hofmann, Weisse, and Philippi contend, chiefly for dogmatic reasons, that the whole book is of Christian origin. There is scarcely any recent author who believes the work to belong to one author. 2. Even Dillmann, who in his translation and explanation still assumed a substantial unity of authorship, has now abandoned his position, in spite of Wittichen's almost entire agreement with his opinion. 3. In the case of the allegories especially, it is now almost universally admitted that they must be ascribed to an author distinct from the writer of the other portions (Krieger, Lücke, 2d ed., Ewald, Dillmann latterly, Köstlin, Hilgenfeld, Langen, Sieffert, Reuss, Volkmar).

*c. Time of Composition of the Book of Enoch.*—In order to determine the period of its composition, we shall divide the book into the sections ascribed to the same authors:

*a.* The original writing consists of chapters i.–xxxvi. and lxxii.–cv., abstracting from a number of more or less extensive interpolations. Volkmar ascribes it to one of Akiba's disciples in the time of Barcocheba. But most authors agree in assigning this portion to the second cen-

tury B.C., either to the earlier years of the Machabean period (Krieger, Lücke, 2d. ed., Langen), or to the days of John Hyrcanus (Ewald, Dillmann, Köstlin, Sieffert, Reuss, Wittenichen), or even to the days of Alexander Jannæus (Hilgenfeld).

B. In regard to the most important section containing the allegories, chapters xxxvi.—lxxi., opinion fluctuates most of all. Here Hilgenfeld, Volkmar, and Colani agree with Hofmann, Weisse, and Philippi in ascribing this part to a Christian author. Hilgenfeld even believes that the writer must have been of the Gnostic sect. The other critics refer the same portion to a pre-Christian period: Langen to the earlier days of the Machabean time; Ewald to about 144 B.C.; Köstlin, Sieffert, and Dillmann (Herzog's R. E., 2d ed., xii. 351 ff.) to some date previous to 64 B.C.; Krieger and Lücke to the early part of Herod's reign; Reuss refrains from suggesting any date at all.

But the main question is: Are the allegories of pre-Christian or of Christian origin? If they date from Christian times, the author must be a Christian. A Jew could not have written the allegories, knowing that he was giving weapons into the hands of the Christians. But, on the other hand, a Christian writer would have hardly avoided so carefully all allusion to the history of Jesus. Why should a Christian speak only of the coming of the Messiah in glory, of his judging the world, without the slightest indication of his first appearance in a state of humiliation and suffering? Surely, this was not an efficient method of gaining souls over to the religion of Christ. The argument of our opponents, based upon the circumstance that according to Matthew xvi. 13–16 and John xii. 34, the expression "Son of Man" was not a common Messianic title at the time of Jesus, whereas it is of frequent occurrence in this sense in the allegories, is without force. For we are by no means at liberty to infer from those passages that the expression "Son of Man" was not at that time a usual Messianic title. In the case of John (l. c.), this

inference is based simply upon false exegesis. The passage in Matthew is much weakened by the circumstance that in another form preserved in Mark viii. 27, which is parallel to Luke ix. 18, the expression "Son of Man" does not occur at all (cf. Edersheim, "The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah," ii. p. 80, 5th ed., New York).

c. The Noachian portions of the book of Enoch have been sufficiently proved by the investigations of Dillmann, Ewald and Köstlin to be identical with the passages liv. 7—lv. 2, lx. 65—lxix. 25; lxviii. 1, and probably also with chapters cvi., cvii., and cviii. These portions are called Noachian, partly because they treat of Noe's time, and partly because they purport to have been written by him. It is impossible to determine the exact date at which these passages were composed. Since our present Ethiopic version of the book of Enoch has been made from the Greek, it may be asked whether it was originally written in Greek, or rather in Hebrew or Aramaic. Volkmar and Philippi contend that the original language was Greek, while all the other scholars assume the Hebrew or the Aramaic as the original language. (Cf. Schürer, "History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ," d. ii. v. iii. p. 54 ff.; Baldensperger, *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu im Lichte der Messianischen Hoffnungen seiner Zeit*, 2d ed., 1892.)

4. *The Book of Jubilees*.—Didymus Alexandrinus, Epiphanius, and St. Jerome quote an apocryphal book under the title τὰ Ἰωβηλαῖα, or ἡ λεπτὴ Γένεσις, from which they borrow various details connected with the history of the patriarchs. Copious extracts from the same work are given by the Byzantine chroniclers Syncellus, Cedrenus, Zonaras, Glycas, from the beginning of the ninth down to the twelfth century. After the twelfth century the book disappeared from notice, and it was considered as lost till it was in the present century discovered in an Ethiopic version in the Abyssinian Church. Dillmann published it for the first time in a German translation (1850–1851), and afterwards in its Ethiopic version (1859). Ceriani found



in the Ambrosian Library at Milan a large fragment of the work in an old Latin version, which he published in the "Monumenta sacra et profana" (vol. i. fasc. i., 1861). Subsequently Rönsch edited the same fragment accompanied by Dillmann's Latin rendering of the corresponding Ethiopic portion of the work, by a commentary and several "Excursus" full of most valuable material (1874). As to the date of the work's composition, Dillmann, Hilgenfeld, Langen, Holtzmann, and Schürer assign it to the first century A.D., before the time of the destruction of Jerusalem. Nöldeke refers the work to the last century before Christ; Rönsch to the sixth decade B.C. It is not so much the Messianic erudition contained in the work that interests us as its direct testimony for the existence of the book of Enoch, and the light it throws on the pious Jewish view of the world at the beginning of the Christian era (Baldensperger, l. c., pp. 20 ff.; Schürer, l. c., pp. 134 ff.).

5. *The Psalms of Solomon*.—In several Christian Old Testament canons the Psalms of Solomon are included at times under the heading "Antilegomena," and again under that of "Apokrypha." These psalms, amounting to eighteen in number, were first printed from an Augsburg manuscript by de la Cerda (1626), and subsequently by Fabricius (1713), while in our own time Hilgenfeld has published an edition, collated with a Vienna manuscript, and this has been made the basis of the editions issued by Geiger, Fritzsche, and Pick. The principal subject of the psalms is the misery of the Jewish nation, and its desire of freedom and redemption through the mediation of the Messiah. It is only by later transcribers that they have been attributed to Solomon. The work itself betrays, according to the critics, very distinct traces of a later origin. Ewald, Grimm, Öhler, Dillmann (formerly), Weiffenbach, and Anger assign the psalms to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes; Movers, Delitzsch, and Keim prefer the time of Herod; but Langen, Hilgenfeld, Geiger, Carrière, Wellhausen, Reuss, Dillmann (now), Nöldeke, Hausrath, Fritzsche, and Wit-

tichen agree with most others that the origin of the psalms must be placed after Pompey's conquest of Jerusalem, about the year 63 B.C. (cf. Schürer, l. c. pp. 17 ff.; Cornely, *Introductio in U. T.*, vol. i. p. 205; Baldensperger, l. c. pp. 25 ff.).

6. *The "Ascensio Mosis."*—According to a passage in Origen (*De princip.* iii. 2. 1) the fact referred to in the epistle of Jude (v. 9) regarding a dispute between the archangel Michael and Satan about the body of Moses has been taken from an apocryphal book entitled the "*Ascensio Mosis.*" Some little information regarding this *Ἀνάληψις Μωυσέως* has also been gleaned from quotations found in the Fathers and in subsequent writers. But a large portion of the work in an old Latin version was only recently discovered by Ceriani in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, where it had been concealed for ages, and published by the same scholar in the *Monumenta* (1861). The work has since then been edited by Hilgenfeld (1866), Volkmar (in Latin and German, 1867), Schmidt and Merx (1868), and Fritzsche (1871). The critics differ considerably about the date of its composition: Ewald, Wieseler, Drummond, and Dillmann refer it to the first decade after Herod's death, Hilgenfeld to the year 44–45 A.D., Schmidt and Merx to the time between 54 and 64 A.D., Fritzsche and Lucius to the sixth decade of the first century A.D., Langen to the time after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, Hausrath to the reign of Domitian, Philippi to the second century of our era, Volkmar to the year 137–138 A.D., while Schürer agrees with Ewald and those who adhere to his opinion. The peculiar Messianic ideas of the "*Ascensio*" will appear clearly throughout the course of this work (cf. Schürer, l. c., pp. 73 ff.; Cornely, l. c., p. 209; Baldensperger, l. c., pp. 27 ff.).

7. *The Revelation of Baruch.*—The larger Peshito manuscript of Milan contains also a revelation of Baruch, regarding which there exists no reliable information. A small portion of it, chapters lxxviii.–lxxxvi., has been otherwise



transmitted to us, and is printed in the Paris and the London Polyglots. Ceriani first published a Latin version of the book (1866), and subsequently published the Syriac text, first in ordinary type (1871), then in a photolithographed facsimile (1883). Fritzsche embodied Ceriani's Latin version in his edition of the Apocrypha, introducing however a few emendations (1871). The prediction of the Anointed is very clear and precise. As to the date of the composition of the book it seems to be certain that it was not written before the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus; but it is impossible to determine whether it was written shortly after the destruction (Hilgenfeld, Fritzsche, Drummond), or during the reign of Domitian (Ewald), or in the time of Trajan (Langen, Wieseler, Renan, Dillmann). Schürer thinks it most probable that the book was composed not long after the destruction of the Holy City, when the question, How could God permit such a disaster? was still a burning one, and in his opinion the work is, at any rate, older than the time of Papias (cf. Schürer, l. c., pp. 83 ff.; Baldensperger, l. c., pp. 37 ff.).

8. *The Fourth Book of Esdras*.—In the appendix of the Latin Vulgate we find among other apocryphal works the so-called Fourth Book of Esdras. Several Greek and Latin Fathers regard the work as genuine prophecy. The fact that it has been translated into Syriac, Ethiopic, Arabic, and Armenian proves its extensive circulation in the East. All the five versions which we now possess are directly or indirectly taken from a Greek text, now no longer extant, but which must be regarded as the original text. The text of the Latin Vulgate consists of sixteen chapters, the first and the last two of which do not appear in the oriental versions, and are, therefore commonly looked upon as additions by a Christian hand. In its original form, then, the book consists only of chapters iii.—xiv. The coming of the Anointed One is clearly foretold in vii. 26–35. Corrodi and Ewald refer the composition of the book to the time of Titus; Volkmar, Langen, Hausrath and Renan to the time

of Nerva; Gfrörer, Dillmann, Wieseler, Reuss, and Schürer to the reign of Domitian. Kabisch (*Das 4te. Buch Esra*, 1889) has of late made an earnest attempt to divide the book according to its various sources, one of which he refers to 100 A.D., the other to 30 B.C. But Baldensperger justly rejects Kabisch's analysis (Baldensperger, l. c., p. 38; Schürer, l. c., pp. 93 ff.; Edersheim, "Jesus the Messiah," vol. ii. pp. 655 ff.).

9. *Talmudic and Rabbinic Sources*.—A word must be added about the vast source-material aggregated in the Talmud and the various Midrashim. Though we must not overestimate the value of these sources, we cannot on the other hand simply ignore them. Too many efforts have of late been made in cultivating this field, which had so long remained fallow, to admit of entire silence about them. Wellhausen's remark that the Talmud is only of secondary importance as a source for the *historical condition* of the pre-Talmudic Jewish people is no doubt correct; but far different is the judgment that must be pronounced about the *ideas* contained in the Talmud. For most of the views expressed by the Talmudic writers date back to the time of Christ, or even to an earlier period. If we then apply ourselves with proper care to these writings, we shall be able to gather from them a great amount of reliable material (cf. Baldensperger, l. c., pp. 43 ff.; Edersheim, l. c. vol. ii. pp. 659 ff.; Appendix 1 of the present vol.).

*Review of the Historical Truth of the Prophecies*.—Thus far we have given the sources from which it may be proved that there really existed Messianic predictions. Our opponents were those who contend that the predictions which we now consider as Messianic prophecies were applied to Jesus in a false and artificial sense, without really referring to him. Thus Christians are accused of manufacturing prophecies by reading into the Old Testament meanings that do not really exist in it. Greg in his "Creed of Christendom" (3d ed., p. 85) expresses the difficulty thus: "The argument would have the force which is attributed to it,

were the objectors able to lay their finger on a single Old Testament prediction clearly referring to Jesus Christ, intended by the utterers of it to relate to him, prefiguring his character and career, and manifestly fulfilled in his appearance on earth. This they cannot do." Dr. Davidson pronounces it as "now commonly admitted that the essential part of biblical prophecy does not lie in predicting contingent events, but in divining the essentially religious in the course of history. . . . In no prophecy can it be shown that the literal predicting of distant historical events is contained. . . . In conformity with the analogy of prophecy generally, special predictions concerning Christ do not appear in the Old Testament" (cf. Smith, "Dictionary of the Bible," ii. p. 932, note i.).

*β.* PHILOSOPHICAL TRUTH OF THE PROPHECIES.—Properly explained, Greg's and Davidson's observations may be understood to impugn the second statement implied in the minor premise of our argument—i.e., the contention that the Messianic predictions which existed before the time of Jesus are real prophecies. It is true that in order to have a real prophecy certain conditions must be verified regarding both prediction and fulfilment. The prediction must precede the event in time, be intelligible and definite in its terms, and foretell something which at the time of its utterance lay beyond the ability of merely human sagacity to foresee. As to the fulfilment, it must be a historically certain event, undoubtedly posterior to the prediction, and accurately correspond with it in terms. It must also be above the suspicion of having been brought about by human means for the purpose of forming an apparent accomplishment of the prediction. These are the essential conditions without the verification of which no real prophecy exists. They may be strengthened by the following accidental notes: The prediction may be part of a connected system of prophecies, it may describe the special coloring and the detailed particulars of the event, and it may finally have a

special supernatural purpose rendering it antecedently probable that God is its author.

1. *Definiteness of the Predictions.*—The priority of Messianic prediction to fulfilment has been established in the preceding paragraphs. As to the definite meaning conveyed by the Messianic prophecies, the Old Testament leaves us no ground to call it in question. We need only glance over the description of the Messiah, his nature, properties, and mission, as laid down in the writings of the prophets, to be convinced of the wrong position of those scholars who refuse to admit the prophecy-argument for this reason. Nor can it be said that the fulfilment of the Messianic predictions was brought about by human means, so as to render the existing predictions apparent grounds for Jesus' real Messiasship. For by human means no one can predetermine the place and the circumstances of his birth, by merely human means no one works miracles, heals the sick, raises the dead, and feeds thousands of people with five loaves of bread; for merely natural ends no one gives himself up to be scourged, to be condemned to death, and to die on the cross; and, finally, by no human means can any one rise from the dead and ascend into heaven.

2. *Agreement between Prediction and Fulfilment.*—As to the exact correspondence of fulfilment and predictions, we must content ourselves for the present with pointing to the treatise on the particular prophecies, where it will appear that a more minute and accurate description of certain portions of Christ's life could have hardly been given by an eye-witness (cf. Rev. B. Maitland, "The Argument from Prophecy," 2d ed., London, 1886, pp. 31 ff.). And the supposition that all these particulars should have been foretold by merely human sagacity is so improbable that it has not been suggested even by the most bitter enemies of the Christian revelation (cf. Kuenen's view as explained in *The New World*, March 1892, p. 816; see pp. 43 ff. of the present vol.).

3. *Three Exceptions.*—Waiving for the present the

other exceptions which are at times made to this part of the argument (St. Thom., Summ. Theol., II.<sup>a</sup> ii.<sup>æ</sup> q. 172; Libermann, Theologia; Nicolas, Études philos. sur le Christianisme; Passaglia, Conférences, pp. 165 ff.; Brugère, De vera religione; La Luzerne, Dissertation sur les prophéties, Paris, 1825, t. 1), we must consider three that can hardly be answered in the course of the treatise. Certain authors, then, impugn the principle that from the fact of an event being predicted it can be inferred that we have to deal with a true prophecy—or, in other words, that God has inspired the utterer of the prediction in question. There are at least three other ways in which such a fact can be explained. First, the supposed prophet may have foretold the future by mere chance; secondly, the prediction may have been suggested by an evil spirit; thirdly, it may be a merely natural phenomenon.

*a. First Exception.*—The first explanation is rendered still more probable by our experiencing in excitable persons a remarkable spirit of mysterious presentiment. And if external circumstances, be they motives of self-love or of patriotism, inflame in such a person an ardent desire of a certain event, what wonder that he utters predictions of what he most ardently wishes for?

*Answer.*—We do not deny the possibility of any one's foretelling by mere chance an entirely unexpected event which afterwards really comes to pass. Nor do we deny the greater probability of such a prediction when the event is ardently desired. But if the predictions include a number of the most minute particulars that are not at all necessarily connected with the event, the probability of a prediction by mere chance becomes very small. And again, if many of the particulars are in themselves very unlikely to happen, and go entirely against the prophet's natural desires, a mere chance prediction of such an event with all its details has no claim to any probability at all. And finally, if the details are not only unwished for, but bring misfortune on the prophet's family and nation, make

reprobates of all the prophet's friends and acquaintances, if the details regard not only a single event but a series of events, in fact a man's whole lifetime, and the failure and success of his life-work, if there is question not of a single prophet but of a series of different prophets living more or less at random at the various epochs of a whole millennium, and still predicting the incidents of a man's life in such a way that all the prophecies are fully consistent with each other and form one organic whole,—supposing all this, the explanation by mere chance is not only intrinsically improbable, but implies a greater miracle than is needed in the explanation by inspiration. We may as well say that Apollo of Belvedere has been constructed out of the marble chips that fell from the works of the different statuaries who lived a thousand years before Apollo was chiselled, and that by mere chance all the single chips fitted so well into each other that nothing was redundant, nothing wanting, as maintain that the Messianic predictions are the outcome of mere chance. For it must be remembered that, considered from a merely natural standpoint, the prophets represent all possible conditions of life and of mental culture. A mere collusion of the inspired Messianic writers is, therefore, simply out of the question (cf. Rev. B. Maitland, "The Argument from Prophecy," 2d ed., London, 1878, pp. 24 ff.).

*b. Second Exception answered.*—As to the exception that an evil spirit may have been the inspiring agent, those who take umbrage in this expedient can no longer disbelieve in God and revelation. For without admitting revelation we have no right to explain facts by other facts which suppose revelation, or, at least, the knowledge of which cannot be obtained without revelation. But, as we well know, the existence of spiritual beings cannot be certainly known without the aid of revelation. Again, those who really believe in revelation cannot explain the Messianic predictions as the mere work of evil spirits, because in this way they destroy their first and only reliable crite-



tion of revelation, the objective truth of miracles and prophecies. For it is only by these that divine revelation may be recognized as such. And these being rendered void, no one has a right to suppose the existence of revelation, as our opponents are obliged to do in their explanation of the Messianic predictions. Hence, in brief, those who have recourse to the inspiration of spirits either admit the existence of revelation or they do not. If they do not admit revelation, they do not know the existence of spirits. If they admit revelation, they must logically admit that by which alone revelation can be known—prophecy and miracle. The case of these adversaries in theology is similar to that of the sceptics in philosophy. Their position supposes a truth which they either openly deny or admit without proof.

*c. Third Exception. M. Nicolas.*—The third class of opponents, explaining the prophetic predictions as merely natural phenomena, consists mainly of rationalists. This school refuses to see in the prophetic phenomena anything beyond merely natural facts, perfectly analogous to those that occur in pagan history. M. Michel Nicolas (*Études critiques sur la Bible, Ancien Testament*, Paris, 1862; *Du prophétisme hébreu*, p. 306) maintains: "The prophet presents himself with the same characteristics and under analogous traits amid the pagan nations and in the midst of the Hebrews; and the narratives which the latter have left us concerning the life and the preaching of their prophets offer striking resemblances with the stories of the former concerning their soothsayers." Two pages further on, the same author continues: "Among the Hebrews as well as among the pagans, prophecy was always accompanied by a violent excitement of the imagination. Prophecy is inseparable from poetry among both Hebrews and Gentiles." Still a few pages further on, we read: "The art of medicine and the art of soothsaying were in ancient times attributed to their prophets by the heathen nations and the descendants of Israel alike." On page 319

of the same work prophetism is said to have existed among the Hebrews, especially at that period "which one may call, in the language of Vico, the heroic age of the house of Jacob. Prophetism ceases when that family, carried along by the general destiny of the nations, after its return from the Babylonian captivity enters into what may be called its human age, or into its historic period properly so called." Finally (p. 321), the author concludes: "One is reduced to a general historical law; the people of Israel is no exception in the midst of the other nations, and Hebrew prophetism enters into the analogy of history."

*α. Ewald's View.*—Ewald believes that naturally God calls every one to know him and to share his divine life. If man is faithful to this call, he rises from truth to truth, becomes God's friend, and partakes of his divine activity. Still, this divine life differs in different men and according to different historical periods. But, in any case, this life is nothing but our natural life brought to its perfection. In a period of special spiritual excitement and elevation it may come to pass that a thought, conceived under divine influence, takes such a hold of man's soul that the latter takes it no longer for its own thought, but for God's inspiration. And since man thinks not only of himself, but also of his country and his friends, he conceives also projects and plans of benefiting his friends and saving his country. If now one of these supposed divine inspirations enters a man's soul, he cannot rest quiet till he has proclaimed his idea for the benefit of the world. Thus one becomes a prophet. The prophet sincerely believes he hears the powerful voice of the Most High; he can hear nothing else, is unable to escape the appeal, is urged to proclaim his inspiration, and finds no rest till he has fulfilled his supposed mission.

*β. Reuss' Statement of the Difficulty.*—Reuss (*Les Prophètes*, t. i. p. 25) agrees with Ewald in reducing the gift of prophecy to the subjective belief in the presence of a divine voice which has no objective reality. It is of



little practical import in the present question whether, according to this last opinion, Hebrew prophecy must be identified with pagan soothsaying, or whether it is one with the national and tribal presentiment of Israel. Both theories have their adherents.

*γ. M. Réville's Addition.*—M. Réville's theory too explains prophecy as "a phenomenon of the life of sentiment." "To-day's psychological medicine," says the learned author (*Revue des deux Mondes*, 15 juin 1867, pp. 823, 824), "seriously studies the numerous facts which prove that nervous superexcitement, which may be caused in various ways, is often accompanied by a remarkable display of feeling, of memory, of clear ideas, and especially of foresight. This foresight is, of course, far from being infallible; but it would be wrong to deny the surprising rapidity and the automatic certainty of the unconscious mental operations at these moments of mental excitement."

*δ. Kuenen's Theory.*—We must not close the statement of our opponents' theories without giving a clear view of Dr. A. Kuenen's position regarding our present subject. For the books "The Religion of Israel to the Fall of the Jewish State" (Dutch ed. 1869-70; English transl. 1874-75) and "Prophets and Prophecy in Israel" (Dutch ed. 1875; English transl. 1877) of the renowned Leyden professor are constantly quoted in our days by both European and American scholars. The former of these is mainly directed against the view which regards the Old Testament chiefly as the fore-court of the temple of Christianity, as a shadow of the Christian truth, as a collection of texts to be interpreted not simply by the New Testament, but also by the later developments of the Christian dogma (*The New World*, March, 1892, p. 77). Kuenen expresses his opinion thus (*Religion of Israel*, vol. i. pp. 10 f.): "It is only by comparison that we can determine whether many persons are right in assuming a specific difference between Israel's religion and its sisters. Without the shadow of doubt, then, we deny the existence of such a difference. . . . The

belief in the exceptional origin of the religion of the Israelites is founded simply and solely on the testimony of their holy records. But that appearance vanishes as soon as we look at it more closely. . . . Although considered as a whole the Old Testament may with justice be adduced as testifying in favor of supernaturalism, its separate parts, regarded by the light of criticism, speak loudly for a natural development both of the Israelitish religion itself and of the belief in its heavenly origin. As soon as the dispute between the whole and its parts is noticed, it is decided." Prophetism is accordingly a merely human phenomenon, coming from God as everything comes from God. But, notwithstanding this, it comes also from man, and specifically it comes from Israel, of whose spirit it is the most exalted expression. It testifies only to the special destiny of Israel and to the duty of man to seek God and perhaps to find him.

ε. *Kuenen's View further Developed.*—Kuenen's other book, "Prophets and Prophecy in Israel," deals more directly with our subject, and was written at the instigation of Dr. John Muir, of Edinburgh, on the occasion of A. Réville's articles in the *Revue des deux Mondes*. Its object is to determine the function of the prophetic thought in the religious development of Israel and of mankind. The book has a polemical and ruthless tone. Kuenen takes the prophetic predictions one by one, and undertakes to show that most of them were not fulfilled, and that those which were fulfilled do not demand any supposition of supernatural insight to account for them. He treats the prophets as living men enveloped in the atmosphere of their own times, acting on the instincts of their own souls, and he finds no need of the supernatural in order to explain their work. The professor places the value of Hebrew prophecy not in its predictive element, but in its creating the conception of ethical monotheism. And in order to shield himself against the blame of irreverence towards the line of prophets, Kuenen says that

the man into whose mind thoughts are mechanically poured by God is no more to be considered great than the warrior who slays his enemy with an enchanted sword. According to him the prophets must cease to be machines, and become thinkers, wielding an enormous moral power (*The New World*, March, 1892, p. 81).

ξ. *Kuenen's Method Illustrated*.—We may add a specimen of Kuenen's reasoning: "A specific supernatural character can in nowise be ascribed to the trance; its divine origin is not at all self-evident; phenomena of that nature were far from uncommon in ancient times and in the Middle Ages, as they occur even at the present day. It is true that for a long time people had no hesitation in ascribing them to supernatural influence. They seemed so singular and extraordinary that this explanation forced itself quite naturally on men's minds. What could not be derived from God was therefore regarded as a display of the power of the devil. But we now no longer occupy that standpoint. Ecstasy is now accurately studied, compared with other affections allied to it, and is explained from the human organism itself, specifically from the nervous system. It may be—on that point I determine nothing at present—that the trances of the Israelitish prophets were of a nature altogether different; but that must be proved separately, for ecstasy in itself is no supernatural phenomenon. It does not therefore advance us a step in determining the origin of the Old Testament prophecy" (*Prophets and Prophecy in Israel*, p. 86, London, 1871; cf. Ladd, *Doctrine of Sacred Scripture*, ii. pp. 440 f., 1883).

*Answer*: 1. *The Naturally Ecstatic State*.—First a word concerning the ecstatic state, the natural character of which both Réville and Kuenen are so careful to notice. In a rude and uncultivated age epileptic and deranged persons may have been regarded as possessed by evil spirits or the divine spirit, as the nature of the case seemed to indicate. Such persons, too, may have had strange experiences and uttered marvellous sayings, supposed to be

inspired by an indwelling spirit. Moreover, the ecstatic state may have been produced by artificial means. The prophets of Baal, e.g., are said to have cut themselves with knives and to have cried out for hours in a frenzy (III. Kings xviii. 29); the necromancers are represented as chirping and muttering in the practice of their art (Is. viii. 19); the Shamans of eastern Asia cast themselves into an unconscious state by means of a tambourine and of stimulants, and though their answers in that state are often surprisingly accurate, they know nothing of what has transpired when they return to consciousness (Tholuck, "Die Propheten," pp. 8 f.); how the Delphian prophetesses were cast into the prophetic state by the foul gases arising from the clefts in the rocks is well known (Tholuck, l. c., pp. 6 f.; cf. Maudsley, "Natural Causes and Supernatural Seemings," London, 1886, pp. 176 f.); the whirling and the howling of the Mahometan dervishes are practised even in our days; the Indian Fakirs cut themselves with knives, as did the prophets of Baal; besides all this we have the kindred phenomena of second sight, of unconscious somnambulism and of hypnotism.

2. *This is nowhere said to belong especially to the Hebrews.*--In these so-called ecstatic conditions involving unconsciousness to the external world, the inner emotional and intellectual faculties may move with greater rapidity and freedom, and may reach the solutions of difficult problems and discern the issues of events far and near. Perhaps there is even added an instinctive prediction and an instinctive guidance through difficulties; but there may be also an entire absence of the latter. Nor do we deny that such phenomena existed among the Hebrews in apparently a similar way as they existed among other nations of antiquity. Thus we read of a band of prophets coming down from the high place with psaltery and timbrel and pipe and harp, and they were prophesying; and when Saul met them, the spirit of the Lord came upon him too and he prophesied with them (I. Kings x. 5 f.); and

again, when Saul went out to seek David the divine spirit came upon him, and he went on and prophesied until he came to Najoth in Ramatha. And stripping off his clothes, he fell down naked all that day and all that night, and he prophesied before Samuel, so that they said: Is Saul also among the prophets? (I. Kings xix. 23 f.) But if this state is alluded to in the Bible, it is certainly not represented as being peculiar to the Hebrews and to their religion (cf. Briggs, "Messianic Prophecy," New York, 1886, pp. 7 ff.).

3. *Fallacy of Kuenen's Induction.*—We furthermore agree entirely with Dr. Maudsley (Natural Causes and Supernatural Seemings, London, 1886, pp. 361, 362): "If all visions, intuitions, and other modes of communication with the supernatural, accredited now or at any time, have been no more than phenomena of psychology,—instances, that is, of subnormal, supernormal, or abnormal mental function,—and if all existing supernatural beliefs are survivals of a state of thought befitting lower stages of human development, the continuance of such beliefs cannot be helpful; it must be hurtful to human progress." But it would surely show a most unscientific bent of mind were we to conclude from the spuriousness of some supposed prophetic ecstasies that all others, even those contained in the Bible, must be rejected as spurious (cf. Briggs, l. c., p. 5). Hence it appears that Kuenen's argument, taken at its greatest value, is not logically conclusive.

4. *The so-called Natural Facts have not yet been explained.*—Then we must keep in mind M. Le Hir's remarks on the present question (Les Prophètes d'Israel, in Études Bibliques, Paris, 1869, t. i. p. 6): "Our psychologic medicine may be able to observe the phenomena of foresight and second sight, but has it explained them? Has it assigned their causes? Not every nervous excitement produces them. And who has proved that in no case a supernatural agent is active? Our ancestors believed this. Are we wiser than they, when without any scientific

proof we attribute their belief on this point to universal ignorance? Ignorance will always produce fools. There are always charlatans, and always enthusiasts, victims of their own illusions. But when they undertake to prophesy, the future will show the folly of their oracles, and thus dispel the charm with which they had fascinated the simple."

5. *Ecstasy is not the Criterion of Prophecy.*—Besides all this, our prophetic argument is not in the least affected by all that Réville and Kuenen have said about the ecstatic state. Were our criterion of true prophecy the ecstasy of its utterer at the time when the prediction is first made, our opponents might, at least, have thrown some doubt on the argument based on such utterances. But ecstasy is not at all necessarily connected with prophecy; many prophecies have been uttered outside of the ecstatic state, as there have been many cases of ecstasy not producing any prophecy. It is not so easy as all this to be a prophet. Since the future does not yet exist for man, he cannot know it naturally except in its causes. If the latter exist already even in a latent state, if there is question of certain physical effects depending on them, a perfectly developed nervous sensibility may perceive them beforehand, as it happens in the case of rheumatic persons or of the tree-frog. But when there is question of a far-off future event, depending on the changeable wills of innumerable agents who are influenced by a diversity of interests, it appears clearer than daylight that no amount of emotion can foresee it naturally. Had our opponents appealed to the power of profound calculations and to the calculus of probabilities, they might have laid claim to a scientific basis of proceeding; but they well know that even scientific men would have smiled at their unsatisfactory explanation of certain historic facts. Our criterion of prophecy is therefore neither the emotion nor the mathematic ability of the prophet, but the exact correspondence of the predicted event with the terms of the predictions, the proper conditions regarding both prediction and fulfilment being verified.



6. *Even one Prophecy, established with Certainty, is God's Testimony.*—But has not Kuenen proved the futility of the prophecy-argument, even on the supposition of this criterion of prophecy being admitted? Has he not, in other words, shown that most of the supposed Old Testament predictions have not been fulfilled? Let us suppose, for a moment, that Kuenen has really proved what he claims to have proved: even on this supposition our prophecy-argument is still valid on Kuenen's own admission. For he freely admits that some predictions have been really verified, though he maintains that in these instances the event predicted could have been foreseen naturally. In the light of science, i.e., of the calculus of probabilities, the last contention cannot be defended. And as long as we have even one real prophecy testifying for the divine nature and mission of Jesus, our conclusion is logically correct. For one prophecy is as much the work of God, supposes as much God's inspiration and expresses as much God's approval, as does the whole series of Messianic predictions. It matters little whether a person has signed a legal document only once, or has repeated his seal a hundred times; so it is of little import whether God's testimony in favor of Jesus' divine nature and mission is given once, or a hundred times, it is infallible in any case. All that is added to our argument by the multiplicity of the Messianic predictions is the greater certainty thereby secured that we have real prophecies and not merely casual predictions; that, in other words, God himself has inspired the utterers of the predictions. Even as in a single extraordinary event it would be hard to determine its strictly miraculous character, so in the case of a single prediction it is difficult to determine whether it is to be attributed to mere chance or to divine illumination.

7. *Falsely Alleged Unfulfilled Prophecies.*—But apart from all this, Kuenen has not proved that most of the Old Testament predictions have not been verified. We need only consider some few of the instances in which the

prophecies are said to have failed, in order to judge of our opponent's position. In regard to the prophecies against Tyre (Is. xxiii. and Ezech. xxvi.) which are alleged to have remained unfulfilled, the difficulty arises from not distinguishing between Old Tyre and New Tyre. Nabuchodonosor took Old Tyre on the continent; but New Tyre, on the island, submitted to the Chaldeans by capitulation. Tyre regained her independence after the fall of Babylon, and became rich and prosperous (cf. Elliott, "Old Testament Prophecy," New York, 1889, p. 52). Amos is said to have prophesied the murder of Jeroboam II., simply because his bitter opponent, the priest of Bethel, thus reported the prophet's words; Amos did not speak of the king in person, but of his house and dynasty (cf. Amos vii. 11 and v. 9). Osee is said to have predicted an Egyptian captivity for the ten tribes, while it is plain from the political circumstances under which the prophet wrote that he predicted only a flight into Egypt, but a captivity in Assyria (cf. Osee viii. 13; ix. 3, 6; xi. 5, 11). Other prophecies were uttered only conditionally, as was the case in the prediction of Jonas and in that of Micheas regarding the destruction of Jerusalem by the Assyrians (cf. Mich. iii. 12).

8. *Philistia's Destruction.*—But we must not omit examples of Kuenen's investigation both of the prophecies regarding pagan nations and of the predictions regarding the chosen people of Israel. A good instance of the former class is the almost unanimous prediction of the prophets that the cities of Philistia were to be destroyed (cf. Amos i. 6-8; Joel iii. 4-8; Ezech. xxv. 15-17; Zach. ix. 4-7; Soph. ii. 4-7; Jer. xlvii.; Is. xiv. 29-32; xi. 14). It must be observed that Kuenen insists on two additional points: First, he maintains that according to these prophecies Philistia's destruction was to happen shortly after the time of the predictions; secondly, that the prophets had expressly indicated the medium through which Philistia was to suffer.

Kuenen himself is fair enough to admit that the medium



of Philistia's chastisement is not indicated by the prophets Amos, Joel, Ezechiel, Zacharias, and Sophonias. He appeals, however, to Is. v. 30 and to Jer. xlvii. 1. The most probable reading of the former passage is the following: "And if one look unto the land, behold darkness and distress, and the light is darkened in the clouds thereof." Having overcome Achaz, the Philistines imagined that they had no more to fear from Juda. Then it was that Isaias spoke to them (Is. xiv. 29): "Rejoice not, O Philistia, all of thee, because the rod that smote thee is broken; for out of the serpent's root shall come forth a basilisk, and his fruit shall be a fiery flying serpent." It is, therefore, Achaz's successor, Ezechias, who is pointed out by Isaias as Philistia's scourge, and it is at his approach from the north that "the smoke of the north" will be perceived in the cloud of dust raised by his military lines. The text of Jeremias (xlvii. 2) speaks only of waters "that rise up out of the north" against the city of Gaza, and to identify these waters with the Chaldaeans is an arbitrary exegesis. Hence, neither Isaias nor Jeremias pointed to the Chaldaeans as the scourge of the Philistine cities.

9. *No Time determined in the Predictions.*—As to the contention of Kuenen that these prophecies were to be accomplished shortly after they had been uttered, there certainly exists no general rule to this effect regarding the fulfilment of prophecy. Rousseau's contention, that we ourselves must witness prediction and fulfilment, is altogether gratuitous. Hence, if Kuenen wishes that his position should have any scientific value, he must prove it in regard to this special class of predictions. In point of fact, the contemporaries of the prophets who uttered the predictions in question did not witness their fulfilment. Sophonias clearly declares that Juda will not possess Philistia till after its return from the Babylonian captivity. Keil, commenting on Sophonias ii. 4, is of opinion that this particular prediction has not yet found its fulfilment. According to this view the material return of Israel from

Babylon was only a figure of the final return of Israel to its God by its conversion to Christ, and after this return will Israel possess the land of Philistia. Without denying the probability of this explanation, we must take notice that Isaias' prediction was sufficiently accomplished by Ezechias, who gained such remarkable advantages over the Philistines that he devastated their territory and pursued them even to the gates of Gaza. Not to mention the Philistine sufferings during the Egypto-Chaldaean wars, there is the most remarkable fact that shortly after the time at which Zacharias predicts the approaching destruction of Gaza and Ascalon, Philistia disappears from the field of history.

10. *Prophecies Concerning Israel.*—Next a specimen of Kuenen's reasoning concerning the prophecies about the future of Israel. Not one of them, he says, has been fulfilled. It seems, he adds, to be an unreasonable contention; but it is the simple truth. The return of all Israel to its native land, the supremacy of Israel over the nations of the earth, in a word, Israel's glory, is still expected and will not be realized till the last days shall come (cf. "The Prophets and Prophecy in Israel," p. 186). To answer Kuenen's observations properly, we have to keep in mind that a double sense must be distinguished in prophecy: the one literal, the other spiritual or typical. Till now, no doubt, most of the prophecies concerning Israel's glory, or all of them, have been fulfilled only in their spiritual sense in the Christian Church. To doubt the reality of such a fulfilment is to forget the important truth, so often insisted on by the Fathers, that the whole Old Testament is a preparation and a type of the New. But at all events, the apostles have hoped, and there is nothing to prevent us from hoping, that the Jews will finally enter the kingdom of God, from which they have thus far freely excluded themselves. And though this may not be a sufficient reason for imagining that the temporal promises of the prophets, not accomplished in the foundation of the

Church, will then find their fulfilment, we have every possible reason for maintaining that all those promises will be fulfilled in a way far surpassing the expectations of the most sanguine believer. For are they not the predictions of the same prophets who foretold the Babylonian Captivity more than a hundred and fifty years before it took place (Mich. iv. 8-10)—even before Babylon had gained its independence—who clearly and accurately predicted the destruction of Jerusalem, who prophesied Babylon's capture by the Medes (Jer. i. 1 f.), and Asia's conquest by Alexander the Great? (Zach. ix. 1-8.) Since God has sealed with his own testimony these predictions, he has also pledged his authority for the truth of the other prophecies from the non-fulfilment of which Kuenen takes his argument against us (cf. Trochon, "*Introduction générale aux prophètes*," Paris, 1883, pp. xix. ff.).

γ. RELATIVE TRUTH OF THE PROPHECIES.—Thus far we have proved the first and second statement implied in the minor proposition of our argument, that there existed Messianic predictions at or before the time of Jesus Christ, and that these predictions were prophecies in the proper sense of the word. We must now briefly consider the third statement implied in the same minor proposition, the statement that the Messianic prophecies were given by God in testimony of Jesus' divinity and divine mission. The logical necessity of this proposition in the prophecy-argument may be inferred from the fact that not every event predicted by true prophecy is therefore of divine origin, or has therefore God's sanction. Jesus really predicted the treason of Judas and the fall of Peter without thereby giving his approval to either event. In the same manner he foretold the destruction of Jerusalem, and at the same time wept over the fate of the unfaithful city,—a certain sign of his disapproval. The coming of Anti-Christ is predicted without having, on that account, divine sanction or divine authority. In the same manner it is not owing to the mere fact of the coming and birth, the

work and suffering of Jesus being predicted that he can claim to be a messenger of God, and to be one with the Father. To establish these claims, Jesus must show that God has given his authority to them by the very fact of predicting them by the mouth of the prophets.

1. *Organic Connection of the Prophecies.*—In order to draw our inference logically, we have to remember that the Messianic prophecies contain a double element: they predict certain outward events whose verification can be perceived by our senses, and they predict certain inward properties and faculties of the Messiah which are not directly subject to our sensitive perception. Now, it must be noticed that these two lines of predictions are so intimately connected that they must proceed from the same author; because the first without the second would be vain and empty, while the second without the first would be entirely useless for the human race. The former might be the work of a mere mountebank, and the latter could never be practically verified so as to affect our moral life and our tenets of belief. Hence the two lines of prophetic predictions are inseparably woven into one organic whole. If then the prophecies regarding the outward events that are subject to our experience are verified and, therefore, proved to be of divine origin,—for God alone can be the author of true prophecy,—the prophecies regarding the inward facts that are above our sensitive experience must be of divine origin too—i.e., must have been inspired by God, and are therefore infallibly true. If, e.g., the event has proved that God really foretold of the Messiah that he will be despised and the most abject of men,—a man of sorrows and acquainted with infirmity,—the same event has proved God to be the author also of those other words: “Surely he hath borne our infirmities, and carried our sorrows. . . . He was wounded for our iniquities, he was bruised for our sins” (Is. liii. 3-5).

2. *Identity of Sacred and Profane Seer.*—Besides this there is another way of inferring God’s testimony for the

divine mission and nature of the Messias from the Messianic prophecies, or perhaps it is the way already indicated, but viewed from a different standpoint. From the fact that a prophet predicted certain future events, which have really come to pass, it may be inferred that God made him his own messenger to his people. Whatever, therefore, this acknowledged divine agent either said or wrote concerning God's kingdom, or the time and manner of its coming, was based upon divine authority. The prophet's contemporaries certainly had no other way of ascertaining the true prophetic nature of the Messianic predictions. For they had not yet the correspondence between prediction and fulfilment to guide them in their belief or disbelief of any given Messianic prophecy. The negative criterion of true prophecy, laid down in Dent. xviii. 22, could not, in the Old Testament, be applied to the Messianic fulfilment, but was observed in the accomplishment of contemporaneous events: "Whatsoever that same prophet foretelleth in the name of the Lord, and it cometh not to pass, that thing the Lord hath not spoken, but the prophet hath forged it by the pride of his mind: and therefore thou shalt not fear him."

## CHAPTER II.

## THE GENERAL DIFFUSION OF MESSIANIC PROPHECY.

ON perusing the records of antiquity we are met by two most striking features pervading all the productions of literature. On the one hand, a universal wail ascends up to heaven deploring the wickedness and the misery of the human race; on the other, a universal strain of expectation vibrates in the human heart, looking forward to a better future and to a coming redeemer. Both these features deserve a moment's reflection.

1. **GENERAL MISERY:** *a.* Among the Egyptians and Indians.—The ancient Egyptians and the Indians looked upon life as a time of penance and reparation. According to them, the soul is a fallen spirit condemned to a union with a material body in punishment for its previous misdeeds. We read in the Veda (v. Bohlen, “*Altes Indien*,” Theil 1, p. 168): “What joy can be found on earth where everything grows worse? Kings have been overturned, mountains have been sunk, the pole has changed its place, the stars have swerved from their course, the whole earth has been visited by a flood, and the spirits have been thrown out of heaven.” Buddha makes the absolute and necessary connection of sorrow with all individual existence the first of the “Four Noble Truths” which are the fundamental articles of the Buddhist creed. It is written: “This, O Monks, is the holy truth concerning suffering. Death is suffering; old age is suffering; sickness is suffering; to be united with what is not loved is suffering; to be parted from what is loved is suffering; not to attain one’s desires is



suffering" (Kellogg, "The Light of Asia and the Light of the World," London, 1885, p. 12).

**b. Among the Persians and Mexicans.**—According to Zoroaster the world is at present ruled by Ahriman; and the old Mexicans said to the child at baptism: "Dear child, Ometeuctli and Omecihuatle have created thee in heaven and have sent thee on the earth. But know that life, which thou now beginnest, is sad, laborious, and full of miseries, and thou shalt not be able to eat thy bread without hardship. May God assist thee in the many miseries which await thee" (Clavigero, t. ii. p. 86).

**c. Testimony of Human Sacrifices and Other Rites.**—Many of the pagan traditions explain the origin of human sacrifices by recalling the time of the Nephilim and the murder of Cain. According to the opinion of the same nations human sacrifices are to cease at the end of the present era. The Mexicans, e. g., believed that the goddess Centeotl or Tzinteotl (like the Greek goddess of justice, who had disappeared on account of human sin, but was to return at the end) would finally gain the victory, abolish human sacrifices, and substitute the offering of the firstlings of the harvest in their place. In the same manner, the Indian Kali (the fallen Eve) has caused death and human sacrifice alike. But she rules only over the present age, and the good Durga-Bhawani will return and gain the victory (Humboldt, "Ans. der Cord." ii. p. 60). Again, the ceremonies of baptism, circumcision, and the other rites of purification following among so many nations the birth of the child, are as many signs of the general belief in man's innate depravity.

**d. The Greek Sages.**—The testimony of the Greek literature is especially important in this question of an early belief in man's fall, because among the Greek writers we meet not only prating collectors of every myth and fable, but men of world-wide wisdom. Hesiod speaks of the iron age consuming man in labor and sorrow (*Op. et dies*, edit. Lipsiæ 1778, v. 176-181); Homer considers man the most

miserable of all that lives and moves on the face of the earth (*Iliad*, xvii. 446, 447; cf. xxiv. 522 ff.); and the ancient oracle given according to tradition by Silenus to Midas (*Arist. ap. Plut. consol. ad Apoll.* p. 27; cf. Cicero, *Tuscul. Disp.* 1, 48) states that it is best for man not to be born.

**e. The Later Greek Writers.**—The opinion of the later scientific Greeks perfectly agrees with that of the earliest writers of fable. For though at first sight the fully developed Greek religion presents an aspect of cheerfulness, especially when it is compared with the melancholy and penitential religious systems of the East, still the greatest thinkers of the nation, one and all, maintain the existence of a universal sorrow. Socrates is of opinion that we must cling to the best of human beliefs as to a board on the ocean, till we shall be favored with the safety of a divine boat (*Phædo*, p. 85, D). The same sage advises Alcibiades to wait with his sacrifices till Providence shall take away his blindness and teach him how to behave toward man and God (*Alcibiades*, ii. pp. 150, 151). Plato describes the lot of the just man on earth in so vivid and true a manner that many have seen in his words a prophecy of Christ's sufferings: "The just man who does not only appear to be just, but is so in truth, will be bound, scourged, tortured, blinded in both eyes, and finally, after suffering all possible pain, he will be hanged; and then he will understand that one must not wish to be just, but only to appear so" (*De rep.* ii. 362).

**f. Greek Philosophic Thought.**—Though Plato describes the ideal state, he at the same time maintains that it exists nowhere on earth, and in conclusion he consoles man with the view of the future life (*De rep.* c. x.; *Phæd.* 246). Krantor, a disciple of Plato's school, teaches that life has through man's guilt become laborious and wretched. In no one is it found in its normal condition (*Plut. cons. ad Apoll.* p. 323, ed. Hutten). Timæus of Lokri, an adherent of the Pythagorean school, confesses that the struggle in us between good and evil is owing more to the guilt of our



ancestors than to the elements of which our nature is composed (*De anima mundi*, p. 103). In general, that life is a state of captivity, a penitential state or a sickness, is defended throughout by the pagan philosophers from Pythagoras down to Cicero. The cry of anguish rising up to heaven from suffering human nature is well symbolized in Prometheus riveted to the hardest rock, and having his heart eaten by the vulture. The "worm that dieth not" of the New Testament and the "conscience" of the Christian Ethics could not have been represented in a more striking manner. Well may St. Paul write to the Romans (viii. 22): "We know that every creature groaneth and travaileth in pain even till now." Modern paganism, throwing off what it considers the shackles of the Christian redemption, returns to the same state of wailing anguish which we notice in the literature of classic paganism (cf. Byron's *Cain*, with Goethe's comment).

**g. Testimony of Roman Writers.**—Man's cry for help and pity grows louder the more civilized the human race becomes. When the wisdom and the civilization of the universe had been concentrated in Rome, then it was that Rome groaned most piteously. Cicero (*De rep.* 3) says that nature is not man's mother, but his stepmother, producing him as she does weak and naked of body, timorous and cowardly in spirit, prone to passions, and endowed with only a spark of soul and understanding. And Seneca (*De ira*, iii. 26; cf. ii. 9, 27, *de benef.* i. 10) considers it useless to cover up with smooth words the universal malady. We are all bad. What one blames in another he finds hidden in his own breast. Wickedly we live among the wicked. The only consolation Seneca can offer his reader is the approaching ruin of the world and of the human race. In the new order of things man will be free from vice (*Quaest. nat.* 3 sub fin.). Marcus Aurelius too complains that the iron age has entered, and that fidelity, honor, justice, and truth have fled from earth to heaven (τῶν πρὸς ἑαυτόν, 1. 5). The satires of Juvenal repeat

the same universal complaint (Sat. xiii. 19-22; xv. 70, 71). The number of the good has been reduced to that of the Nile's outlets and of the gates of Thebes. If a god deigns to look down upon the earth, he turns away, deriding and despising the human race. In the epistle of St. Paul to the Romans we find the explanation of the fact that God allowed man to fall so low (viii. 20): "The creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him that made it subject, in hope."

**2. GENERAL HOPE OF REDEMPTION.**—*a. The Persians.*—But the expectation of a future redeemer is not less universally expressed in the classical literature of antiquity than is the persuasion of the fall. A glimpse at the national traditions of the various tribes and countries in the ancient world will prove the existence of such a universal expectation, and show the character of the redeemer thus expected. To begin with the Persian traditions, they must be considered connectedly in order to be fully understood. Ahriman with the help of his poison overcomes the bull Abudad. The latter when dying utters the words: "Behold, what is to happen to the creatures that are to come: It is my will to protect them against evil." From the right hip of the dying Abudad proceeds Kajomords, the first man, and Ahriman now directs his fury against him. After a thirty years' battle Kajomords is at length overcome, but he too at the moment of his death utters the prophecy: "Thou hast entered as enemy, but all the men of my seed will do what is good and will overthrow thee" (Zendavesta, Budehesh. 3 and 4; Kleuker, Anhang z. Zend., Bd. ii., Th. 3, p. 172).

The whole setting of the latter prediction in the Persian system of religion shows that the term "all men" does not refer to all the descendants of Kajomords, but denotes only all the future redeemers. In point of fact, the Persians apply it to Zoroaster, as the context demands. For when Goshorun is standing near the dead body of the bull and laments over the misfortune that has befallen the earth,

Ormuzd answers him in the following way: "The bull is fallen indeed through Ahriman. But this man is reserved for an earth and a time where Ahriman will have no power." Then showing him the Ferver (spirit of Zoroaster), Ormuzd continues: "Him I shall give to the world, and he will keep it pure from evil."

Though the adherents of the Zendavesta apply this prophecy to Zoroaster, as we have seen, they do not take the latter for the true Messiah. Sôsyôsh will, according to them, be the true and final redeemer, and the two prophets Osheder Mah and Osheder Bami will precede him. In the last millennium, Osheder Bami will appear and bind the sun for ten days and nights, convert one half of the human race to the law, and add the twenty-second Nosk or part to the law. Four hundred years later, Osheder Mah will come, bind the sun for twenty days and twenty nights, convert one third of the human race to the law, and add the twenty-third Nosk or part to the same. At the end of times, Sôsyôsh will appear, bind the sun for thirty days and thirty nights, i. e., extend the time of the day to that length, add the twenty-fourth Nosk or part to the law, and convert the whole human race to the Zendavesta. As to the birth of the three redeemers, all three will be born of pure virgins. As Zoroaster sprang from the seed of Kajomords the first man, so will the future saviours spring from the seed of Zoroaster. For the seed will accidentally be mixed with the waters of lake Kâsava, where the three undefiled virgins will conceive when bathing in the water. We need not here give the further details about the victory of Zoroaster's seed, about the virginal birth of the prophets, and about the comet Gurzsher, corresponding perhaps to the star of Jacob.

**b. The Indians.**—Turning now to India we may at first imagine ourselves face to face with religions that are at the farthest possible remove from Christianity—religions that leave no room for the existence of a God or of a redeemer. Brahmanism, indeed, retains the name of a God, proceeding, as it does, from the one God Varuna to the

worship of its three hundred and thirty millions of gods. But, after all, the world is for the Brahmanist nothing but an emanation from Brahma, the absolutely holy, infinite and impersonal being. Gods, spirits, different castes of men, animals, trees, bushes, herbs, and, finally, the lifeless and the inorganic matter proceed in regular order from the same impersonal source. Of a God in the true sense of the word there is not the slightest question.

Consoling as this system may seem to the agnostics and the positivists of our day, Buddhism is still more congenial to them. Its very origin commends Buddhism to its admirers, beginning as it does with the rejection of the whole Brahmanic system of supposed religious revelation. As modern unbelief is noted for its utter contempt of authority in matters of science and of religion, so did Buddha speak as a "plain man" who had sought for rest and found it without the assistance of Brahman priest, and without the light of divine revelation (cf. Kellogg, "*The Light of Asia and the Light of the World*," London, 1885, p. 16).

Besides, like the atheism of our modern scientists, Buddha's atheism is modest, negative and agnostic. As Herbert Spencer thinks that "the power which is manifested in the universe is utterly inscrutable," so Buddha believes that "there is one thing which is not in the dominion of the intellect—to know whence come all the beings of the universe, and whither they go" (A. Rémusat, *mel. posth.* 121, quotes an ancient Buddhist Sutta; cf. Koeppen, "*Die Religion des Buddha*," p. 231).

Returning now to our subject, both Brahmanism and Buddhism recognize the necessity of redemption, but in such a manner that they make man his own redeemer. If the Gospel tells us of a God who became man to save the human race, Brahmanism speaks of man being physically absorbed into God, and Buddhism reveres a man who became God, even the Buddha, who, under the Bo-tree, attained to all power and knowledge. When the adherent

of Brahmanism, after his millions of births and purifications of the most various kinds, is finally reabsorbed into the divinity whence he had emanated, he attains to his happiness through his own unaided strength. Similarly Buddha did not save man, but only showed him how he may save himself. Buddhism ever insists on the fact that the Buddha attained his end by his own exertion and merit, and that any man who is willing to walk in the same path will arrive at the same end. Fully in accordance with this doctrine, Buddhism denies the existence of an impassable gulf between the brute-creation and man. A pig or a rat may, at any time, become a man, and even a Buddha, as Buddha himself is said to have been at one time a pig, at another a rat (Kellogg, "*The Light of Asia and the Light of the World*," London, 1885, p. 7).

Gautama Buddha was by no means the first, nor will he be the last Buddha. The succession of Buddhas is believed to be without beginning and without end. We become acquainted with Gautama first when he is living at an inconceivably remote period in the city Amaravati as a rich Brahman, named Sumedha. Reflecting on the vanity and sorrow inseparable from life, he determined to renounce his wealth and become an ascetic, that he might attain a state in which there is no rebirth. About the same time, Dipankara Buddha appeared in the world, and as on one occasion he was coming where the ascetic Sumedha was staying, the Bodhisat (he who is to become a Buddha) cast himself in the mire that Dipankara might walk over him. And as he lay in the mire, beholding the majesty of Dipankara Buddha with unblenching gaze, he thought thus: "If I wished, I might this day destroy within me all human passions. But why should I in disguise arrive at the knowledge of the truth? I will attain omniscience and become a Buddha, and save men and angels. Why should I cross the ocean, resolute but alone? I will attain omniscience and enable men and angels to cross. By this resolution of mine, I, a man of resolution, embarking in the

ship of the truth, I will carry across with me men and angels."

This is the much-vaunted resolution by which Gautama Buddha gave himself up for the salvation of man. But how does it compare with the self-sacrifice of the Son of God, who gave himself up for our redemption, as one sent by the Father? (Kellogg, l. c., pp. 65 ff.) Whether the forms of Brahmanism and Buddhism thus far described be regarded as very ancient, or as comparatively recent, is of little importance in the present question; in either case it is certain that the great body of Indian nations recognizes the necessity of redemption.

c. **The Chinese.**—Turning now to the religious ideas of the Chinese, it must be kept in mind that for ages they have been educated and lived in the system of Confucius. Not as if Confucius could claim to be the founder of a religion, such as were Buddha and Mohammed; but still, his maxims and principles have penetrated into the very marrow of Chinese life and Chinese thought. The most telling characteristic of Confucius is found in the Luen-jue (Plath, p. 89): "He did not refuse chosen food, nor well-cleaned rice, nor fine-cut meat; but spoiled food, stale fish, tainted meat, and all that had a bad color or odor he did not touch. He did not eat what had not been well carved, or what had not its proper sance. Even when there was abundance of meat, he did not overeat himself; as to wine, he did not bind himself to any definite quantity, but he never allowed his mind to be disturbed. He did not drink wine bought in the market, nor did he eat dried meat. Never did he eat without Ingwer, . . . and while eating he did not speak. . . . When his mat was not placed right, he did not sit down on it. . . . When invited to a well-provided dinner, he changed color, stood up, and expressed his obligations to his host." From this description we see that Confucius was nothing but a utilitarian of the worst class. Still, even this Epicurean materialist announced that the truly Holy One should appear in the West.



Whether we refer to She-wen-lui-thsin (c. 35) or Chan-Thang-she-shao-tehing-thi (c. 1) or Lini-theu-Thsionan-chu, we always find the same hope expressed. The minister Pi said to Confucius: "Master, are you not a holy man?" He answered: "In spite of my greatest efforts, I cannot recollect any man worthy of this name." Pi replied: "Were not the three princes (the founders of the first three dynasties, Hia, Shang, and Dshen) saints?" "The three princes," said Confucius, "were possessed of boundless goodness, a lofty spirit, and an unconquerable fortitude. But I am not willing to decide whether they have been saints." Again the minister asked: "Were not the five emperors (the patriarchs before the flood, from Fo-hi to Shuen) saints?" "The five emperors," he replied, "were good, of great mildness and incorruptible justice; but I do not know whether they have been saints." "But," continued Pi, "are not the three illustrious ones (i.e., the three so-called Sanhoang or macrocosmic emperors before Fo-hi, Tien-hoang or emperor-heaven, Ti-hoang or emperor-earth, Shin-hoang or emperor-man) worthy of this name?" Confucius said: "The three illustrious ones well knew how to employ their time of life; but I dare not call them saints." Wholly astonished, the minister exclaimed: "Who then is the true saint?" Confucius replied enthusiastically, but in a soft tone of voice: "I have heard that the true saint will arise in the far West; he will end all confusion without governing, he will excite unconditional faith without speaking, he will produce an ocean of meritorious works without changing the appearance of things. No one knows his name, but I have heard that he alone should be the true saint."

The old prophecy according to which the true saint was to arise in the far West caused the emperor Ming-di, of the dynasty Han, to send about 65 A.D. two mandarins to the West with orders not to return until they should have found either the saint himself or his religion. Arriving in India, the two envoys accidentally came to know the ris-



ing sect of Buddhism, and took it for the expected religion of the great saint. In consequence of this, the Chinese Buddhists highly esteem the saying of Confucius, applying it to their own reputed prophet. Omitting numerous other references to this same great saint in the Chinese traditions, it must be noted that they attribute to him almost divine attributes, and even speak of his sufferings and his battles. Desguignes (*Mem. de l'Acad. des Inser.* t. 45, p. 543) maintains: "In China there exists a very old belief that the religion of the idols by which the primitive religion has been vitiated will be followed by a new religion which will last till the end of the world." And Ramsay (*Disc. sur la Mythol.* p. 150; cf. Nicholas, "*Philos. Stud.*," Bd. 2, p. 130) tells us: "The books *Likyki* speak of a time when all will be restored to its primitive splendor, owing to the advent of a hero called *Kiuntse*, i.e., shepherd or prince, who is also named "most holy," "universal teacher," and "highest truth."

**d. The Later Arabians and Persians.**—Passing on to the nations of western Asia, we meet first of all among the writings of the later Arabs and Persians the fable of the pre-Adamite *Solymans*. *Solyman Hakki* distinguished himself in the battle against the demons and the giants; but *Anthalus* he could not destroy, in spite of his repeated victories. Consulting the goddess *Takuin*, the mistress of fate, she answered him that the victory over that *Solyman* was reserved for a descendant of Adam, who would reduce him to his obedience and take his life in case he should refuse the oath of allegiance (*Lüken*, "*Die Traditionen*," p. 369). The bird *Simmorg*, the *Phœnix* of the Arabs and the Persians, revealed according to the fables of those nations to *Thamuraz*: "Another *Solyman* will arise out of Adam's race, and will surpass all in majesty and power, and after him no other will appear on earth" (*D'Herbelot* s. v. *Soliman ben Daud*, *Thahamurath*). These traditions are the more remarkable, because they are not applied by the Mohammedans to their prophet, but to Solomon. Now

Solomon himself loses his magic ring and falls into the power of Asmodi. Subsequently, his wife receives the promise that the Messiah should descend from her. As to Mohammed, he is identified with the Paraclete, his name Achmed agreeing in meaning with Periclyt; but notwithstanding all this, the Mohammedans expect the return of the Mahadi, their tenth Iman, born in the year 255 of their era. He will do battle against Antichrist, and together with Issa (Jesus) he will establish the reign of the millennium.

However scanty may be our knowledge of the ancient Egyptian traditions, we know, at least, that they expected an Apocatastasis, or restoration, at the end of our present era. The Messianic hopes of the Egyptians may, however, be traced in their fable of Horus, the son of Isis, and of Osiris. From Horus' very birth both mother and son are persecuted by Typhon; the son is killed and sunk to the depths of the lower world. But being destined as the seed of the woman to kill the serpent, he rises again to bind and slay Python (Plut. de Is. 19). Diodorus tells us that among the Libyans the following tradition was current: Ammon, driven out of his reign, predicted the coming of his son Dionysius, the restoration of his kingdom by the instrumentality of his son, and the latter's divine dignity and worship (Diod. iii. 73). In the light of this prophecy we understand why Alexander the Great claimed to be a son of Ammon.

*e. The Greeks.*—Among the Greeks too we find Messianic expectations based upon Messianic prophecies. Leto or Latona, after her fall, must err about and is persecuted by the dragon Pytho, because she has received the promise that her seed shall conquer and slay the serpent. She brings forth her twins, and Apollo now represents both Cain (killing Hyacinthus) and the Messiah (conquering the serpent Pytho at the foot of Mount Parnassus). But Greek hope was not satisfied with a past fulfilment of the

prophecy. According to them, Apollo will return at the end of the iron age and restore the golden age.

Besides Apollo, many other Messianic characters are known in Greek literature. We need only recall Jason, Epaphus, Persens, and Hercules. All are born of a mortal mother, but conceived of a god; in the case of all there is the characteristic persecution on the part of the bad principle; all are noted for their victory over the serpent or the dragon, and nearly all bruise the monster's head.

The fable of Prometheus illustrates the Greek Messianic hope most beautifully. Riveted to the rock in punishment for his compassion with man, and fed upon by the never-sated vulture, the hero gives forth the oracle which the old goddess Themis had confided to him alone. The rule of Zeus is to have its end by the instrumentality of a son whom Zeus himself will beget of mortal seed. More powerful than his father, he will give Prometheus his freedom (*Æschyl.*, *Promethens vinet.*, vv. 906 ff.; *Pind.*, *Isthm.* vii. 26; *Apollon. Rhod.*, iv. 794 ff.; *Apollod.*, iii. 13, 5; *Quint. Smyrn.* v. 338; *Schol. Hom. Il. i.* 519; *Schol. Lycophr.* 178). To understand the oracle right, it must be remembered that Zeus represented among the Greeks a double character: he was the highest god, but at the same time he was the originator of the iron age. Hence it appears that the conqueror of the iron age and its Lord is at the same time the liberator of the god who suffers for the good of the human race. We cannot help noticing the difference between the pagan Faust of the Christian Goethe, and the Christian Prometheus of the pagan *Æschylus*. The former leaves the discord between striving humanity and the everlasting deity unsettled; the latter saves Prometheus, the representative of mankind, by the vicarious sacrifice of a benevolent god.

*f. The Germanic Races.*—We find the Messianic expectations not less flourishing among the Germanic races than among the Greeks, the Indians, and the other nations of the far East. Baldur and Tyr are, according to the

German fable, the sons of the first parents Odin and Frigga. Baldur dies early by the hands of the blind Hodur; instead of Tyr, properly Tius or Deus, we find also Thor, the giant thunderer, whose rôle seems to agree exactly with that of Cain. In his Messianic capacity Thor reveals himself especially in his battle against the serpent Mitgard, which dwells deep in the abysses of the sea. But according to the later Edda, Thor will not conquer the serpent fully till about the twilight of the gods, i.e., the end of the present era. Paganism is here again conscious of the Messiah's coming at the end of time in spite of the mythic endeavors to make the first son of man the redeemer of the race. Among the more recent Messianic heroes must be noted Sigurd, or Sigfrid, whom the old Northern genealogies place in the fifth generation after Odin—i.e., in the time after the flood. In order to connect his descent with the fall in paradise, the fable starts with the eating of the apple. The giant woman gives the apple to Rerir, who eats it, and in consequence his wife becomes pregnant, thus giving rise to the race of the Völsungr, Sigurd's family. We need not here delay over Sigfrid's conquering the serpent, regaining the golden treasure, and redeeming Brynhilde, the enchanted virgin.

Besides these redeemers of the past, another Messiah of the future was expected by the Germanic races. Descending from Odin and the giant woman Gridr, Vidar will be the most powerful and the strongest after the Lord of thunder. He is now hidden, but when at the end of time the monsters of darkness are once more let loose, he will destroy the Fenrirswolf by stepping on his head or into his throat. For this purpose he will be shod with the celebrated shoe made of all the leather strips that will be collected till the end of time. Odin and all the other gods will then perish, and the golden age will return.

**g. The Celtic Races.**—Among the Celts we find the traditions concerning King Arthur and the Parzival. After travelling about in the world and destroying all that

is bad, Arthur with his knights is enchanted in order to return at some future time, and then restore the old order of things. Parzival, the son of Gamuret, the biblical Gomer, has a brother Feirefiss, entirely unlike himself. After incurring a curse by the murder of the knight Gahewiz, he errs about in the world, redeems the sinful king of the holy Grail Amfortas, and reconquers that treasure; then he withdraws into the desert and does not return.

**h. The Esthenians.**—The traditions existing among the Esthens concerning Kalewe Poeg, the son of Kalewa, the god of thunder, deserve a special mention. The father first prophesies to his wife the birth of a son, who is to be entirely like himself. The young hero's greatest deed is his victory over the old sorcerer in the sea Peipus. But as we learn in the Kalewala, while Kalewe Poeg severs the head of the sorcerer from his body, he loses his sword. The future redeemer expected by the Esthens will find this sword and use it. According to the Finnish version of the Kalewala, the hero is named Lemminkainen; in his youth he is killed and cut into pieces, but he will be raised to life after his mother has gathered all the pieces in the realm of the dead. He will also regain the Sampo, i.e., the lost treasure of paradise, in the land of the northern giants.

**i. The Tribes of the Pacific Islands.**—Messianic expectations are also found among the wild tribes of the South Sea and of America. Among the Sandwich Islanders we meet the old tradition that their god and the first man, Rono, had left the island in the following manner: His wife, having sinned with a mortal man, had been thrown by the enraged husband into the depths of the sea. Penitent and sorry for his deed, he set out in a boat for the paradisiacal land Haiti, i.e., Tahiti, the mother-country of the Sandwich Islanders. Rono left, however, the consoling promise that at some future time he would return on a rich floating island, bringing with him all that man could desire. When Captain

Cook first landed on the island, the inhabitants took him for the returning Rono; and though they killed him, they even now venerate his bones as those of a god. The expectation existing on the Society Islands, that at some future date a miraculous boat, "the ship of the Mawi," should appear, probably refers to the same tradition among the inhabitants that at a remote past time their god left their island in his boat.

**k. The Mexicans.**—The Mexicans too believed that their beneficent god Quetzalcoatl, who had been obliged to leave the country after the golden age had flourished under his rule, would return and restore the former state of happiness. The old religion with its human sacrifices was then to cease, and the first-fruits of the earth were to be offered instead of men. The return of the just woman Centeotl would, as a matter of course, accompany that of the god. It is well known that the Mexicans took the Spaniards, on their first arrival in Mexico, for the messengers of Quetzalcoatl. We need only recall the words of Montezuma addressed to the new arrivals: "We well know," he said, "that the great king under whose obedience you stand is a descendant of our own Quetzalcoatl, who is Lord of the seven caverns of Navatla and rightful king of the seven nations from whom the Mexican empire has taken its rise. This great Quetzalcoatl has left us several prophecies, which we look upon as infallible truth. From these as well as from the records which for many centuries have been kept in our history, we know that he has left this land and has sought new lands in the East, leaving the promise that in time to come a nation descending from him should return and change our laws and our system of government."

**l. The Peruvians.**—As to the Peruvians, they had very nearly the same traditions. Their two most remarkable heroes were Inka Manko Capak, the founder of the empire, and the Inka Virakocha, its restorer. The latter had prophesied to the Peruvians that at some future period the Inkas should lose both their power and the worship which



was paid them. At the same time, they expected the return of Virakocha, or their Messias; and an ancient tradition had fixed the period of salvation as following the twelfth generation of Inkas. In point of fact, the twelfth Inka, Huayna Capak, when at the point of death, heard of the Spaniards' arrival at the coast, and announced to the nobles of the realm and to his sons that now the old prophecy of the Sun, their father, should be fulfilled, and that the rule of the Inkas should cease with himself. Those strangers who had landed at the coast were no doubt the very men indicated by the prophecy; they would bring better laws, and conquer besides the kingdom of the Inkas many other kingdoms. The Inka Atahualpa, the son of Capak Huayna, saluted the Spaniard Pizarro: "Welcome to my lands, Capak Virakocha!"

*m. Domingo, the Algonquin, etc.*—According to tradition, a similar Messianic hope was entertained in the island of Domingo, and communicated to Columbus on landing in the place. Even in Greenland the expectation is prevalent that towards the end of time the golden age will begin, and the earth will assume a new and more beautiful form. We may also appeal to the Algonquin fables concerning Manabozho, or Mishapu, or Hiawatha. The Christian Apaches of Mexico identify Jesus with their serpent-killer, Tuballishine, and Tuballishine's mother with the virgin Mary. The traditions of the Caribbean Islands, that formerly a son of the god Puru had come from heaven and conquered the serpent, seem to recall the story of St. Michael fighting against the dragon (cf. Kruse, *Urgeschichte der Esthen*, pp. 176 ff.; Kalewala, 14, 15, 39 rune; Kotzebue, *Reise um die Welt*, Bd. ii. p. 88; Ellis, *Reise durch Hawaii*, Deutsche Uebers., Hamburg, 1827, p. 67; Ellis, *Polynesian Res.*, v. ii. p. 53; Clavigero, *stor. di Messico*, t. ii. p. 11; Humboldt, *Vues des Cordill.*, t. i. p. 265; *Allg. Hist. d. R. Th.* xiii. p. 239, 346; *Allg. Gesch. von Amerika*, Th. 2, p. 107; Garcilasso de la Vega, *Hist. des*



Yncas, l. v. c. 28; l. ix. c. 15; Kranz, *Gesch. von Groenl.*, Th. 1, p. 263).

With the exception of the negro tribes, concerning whose traditions we know very little, all the pagan nations of both the old and the new world have their own special Messianic prophecies, which are all said to date from the very beginning of man's existence on earth. According to all, the present iron age is to pass away when the race shall have reached the height of depravity. The age of sin and misery shall cease; even the very gods who, like jealous demons, guard the world at present, shall lose their power, and a mighty and wise ruler and hero shall spring from the seed of the first woman, being at the same time of divine origin, and shall crush the head of the demon and initiate an age of happiness and innocence, not unlike the original golden age of the world.

**n. The Romans.**—**α. THE ETRUSCAN SEERS.**—We have not yet mentioned the general expectation of a Saviour existing about the time of Christ's birth. The prophecies referring to this subject spring from two sources: the Etruscan books of fate and the Sibylline predictions. The Etruscan seers announced, even during the civil war between Marius and Sulla, that the new age of restoration was about to begin and would embrace eight or ten centuries (cf. *Rei agri Scr.* p. 258; Jahn, *Censor. de die nat.*, p. 45 adn.; *Plut. Sulla vii.* p. 456; *Suidas s. v. Sullas*). About forty years later the priestly prophet Vulcatius explained the comet appearing at Cæsar's death as a sign of the beginning of the new era; but he is said to have been struck dead while uttering the prediction for thus betraying the secret of the gods (*Serv. ad Virg. Ecl. ix.* 47). The restorer of the golden age was to be a son of Zeus, or rather of Apollo, and of a mortal mother; according to others it was Apollo himself. A few months before the birth of Augustus there happened a portent in Rome which signified, according to the Etruscan interpreters, that nature was about to give forth a future king of Rome. The

frightened senate gave orders that no child born in that year should be allowed to live, and it was only by the endeavors of those whose wives were then pregnant that the decree was not entered into the archives, and thus did not obtain the force of law (Sueton., Octav. c. 94). Nigidius Figulus, who knew the Etruscan books of fate better than any one else understood them, predicted when Augustus' father came too late into the Senate on account of the confinement of his wife, that the Lord of the universe had been born. Hence, Augustus assumed the character of the prince of peace and of a son of Apollo; report had it that his mother had conceived him by touching a dragon in the temple of Apollo (Sueton., l. c.). On coins he called himself the Saviour of the world, "*salus generis humani*," and had himself represented as Apollo (cf. Patinns, *Notæ in August.* p. 24 and *Notæ in Galb.* p. 52; Suetonius, *ex recens. Graevii*, etc., *Trajecti ad Rhenum*, 1703). Hence Anchises too, when predicting the future to Æneas, points to Augustus as a son of God, who shall restore the golden rule of Saturn and subdue the whole world; his advent was even then predicted by the oracles of the Caspian commonwealths and at the mouth of the Nile (Virg., *Æneis* vi. 792 ff.).

β. THE SIBYLLINE SOURCES.—Nor is it only the Etruscan seers that predicted the Messiah; the Sibylline books are even more pronounced in this regard than the Etruscan books of fate. At Cæsar's time the Sibylline announcement that a king would bring safety to the Roman people frightened all the republican citizens of Rome (Cicero, *de divin.* ii. 54; cf. *Epist.* l. i. 1). Virgil's fourth Eclogue has been considered as a Messianic prophecy even by the Fathers of the Church (cf. Augustin., *de civ. Dei.* x. 27; cp. 155). We need not repeat that the poet himself bases his prediction on the Sibylline prophecies. At present we have only a Jewish-Christian edition of these predictions, which is undoubtedly much interpolated and mutilated. The true

Sibylline prophecies were destroyed by the burning of the capitol; but about 77 B.C. they were again carefully collected, so that Virgil may well refer to the original text. Even Horace (Carm. 1, od. 2) and Lactantius (Instit. 1. vii. c. 18 and 24) seems to paraphrase certain portions of the same predictions. The Sibylline prophecies were so much circulated at the time of Augustus that he found it necessary to have all private copies collected and burnt (Sueton., Octav. c. 31). The same process was repeated under the reign of Tiberius (cf. Hartung, "Rel. der Römer," Th. 1, p. 134).

γ. DESPAIR AT NON-FULFILMENT.—And when the general expectation of the pagan world seemed not to be fulfilled, a kind of universal despair took the place of the Messianic hope. The predictions concerning the end of the world, which too were contained in the Sibylline books, began to occupy men's minds, and the philosophic writers began to consider the way and manner in which that destruction would take place. Such considerations we find in Seneca (Quæst. Nat. l. iii. sub fin.), Pliny (Hist. Nat. vii. 16), the younger Pliny (Sec. Epist. l. vi. 20), Dio Cassius (cf. Sepp, "Leben Jesu," Bd. i. p. 331), and even in the works of Lactantius, who relates the opinions of what he calls the worldly prophets (Instit. vii. 14).

δ. ORIGIN OF MESSIANIC PROPHECY.—If it be asked whence these Messianic predictions could have originated among the pagan nations of the ancient world, the answer may be reduced to three or four heads: 1. On the only true supposition that all men descend from Adam, the pagan Messianic ideas may be remnants of a primeval revelation. And should one consider this source insufficient to account for the numberless recollections that are left to the heathen nations, one might 2. admit that God granted from time to time a more than ordinary foresight to the pagan predictors of the future, or 3. appeal to the intercourse between the Jews and the various nations, or at least to the spread of the Jewish prophetic literature

among the literary men of the ancient world. To say that the agreement of the various national Messianic hopes is due to chance is surely a most unscientific way of explaining an established historical fact.

**o. The Hebrews.**—*α.* To SOLOMON.—Coming now to the spread of Messianic prophecy among the Hebrews, we find Messianic predictions in the shape of promise and threatening in the Book of Genesis. Immediately upon the fall, hopes of recovery and salvation are held out; but the manner in which this salvation is to be effected is left altogether indefinite. All that is at first declared is that it shall come through a child of woman (Gen. iii. 15). By degrees the area is limited: it is to come through the family of Sem (Gen. ix. 26), through the family of Abraham (Gen. xii. 3), of Isaac (Gen. xxii. 18), of Jacob (Gen. xxviii. 14), of Juda (Gen. xlix. 10). Balaam seems to say that it will be brought by a warlike Israelite king (Num. xxiv. 17), Jacob by a peaceful ruler (Gen. xlix. 10), Moses by a prophet like himself, i.e., a revealer of a new religious dispensation (Dent. xviii. 15). Nathan's announcement determines further that the salvation is to come through the house of David (II. Kings vii. 16), and through a descendant of David, who himself shall be king. This promise is developed by David in the Messianic Psalms. Pss. xvii. (xviii.) and lx. (lxi.) are based on the promise communicated by Nathan, and do not exceed the announcement of that prophet. The same may be said of Ps. lxxxviii. (lxxxix.), which was composed by a later writer. Pss. ii. and cix. (cx.) rest upon the same promise, but add new features to it. The son of David is to be the son of God (ii. 7), the anointed of the Lord (ii. 2), not only the king of Sion (ii. 6; cix. 1), but the inheritor and the Lord of the whole earth (ii. 8; cix. 6); and besides this, a priest forever after the order of Melchisedech (cix. 4). At the same time he is, as typified by his progenitor, to be full of sorrows and suffering [(Pss. xxi. (xxii.), lxx. (lxxi.), ci. (cii.), cviii. (cix.)] brought down to the grave, yet raised to life without corruption

[Ps. xv. (xvi.)]. In Pss. xlv. (xlv.) and lxxi. (lxxii.) the sons of Core and Solomon describe his peaceful reign.

β. CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY.—The following table exhibits a chronological summary of the Messianic prophecies as they are represented by Vigouroux (Manuel Biblique, ii. p. 472):

# FIRST EPOCH: THE PENTATEUCH.

## I. PERIOD: ADAM.

1. *Divine promise given to Adam or Protevangel* (Gen. iii. 1-15).

## II. PERIOD: PATRIARCHAL PERIOD.

2. *Prophecy of Noe: blessing of Sem* (Gen. ix. 18-27).

3. *Third Prophecy: Promises given to the Patriarchs:*

### A. To Abraham:

- a. First promise (Gen. xii. 1-7).
- b. Repetition of the same (Gen. xiii. 14-17; xvii. 1-9).
- c. Confirmation of the same (Gen. xviii. 17-19).
- d. Repeated confirmation (Gen. xxii. 16-18).

### B. To Isaac: Repetition of the promise (Gen. xxvi. 1-5).

### C. To Jacob: Repetition of the promise (Gen. xxviii. 10-15; cf. xxxv. 11, 12).

4. *Fourth Prophecy: Jacob's blessing* (Gen. xlix. 8-12).

## III. PERIOD: MOSES.

5. *Fifth Prophecy: Balaam's prediction* (Num. xxiv. 17).

6. *Sixth Prophecy: Moses prophesies* (Deut. xviii. 15-19).

## SECOND EPOCH: FROM SAMUEL TO DAVID.

- I. Prophecies contained in the historical books:
  1. Canticle of Anna (I. Kings ii. 10).
  2. Davidic promises (II. Kings vii. 8-16; cf. III. Kings xi. 29-39).
- II. Prophecies contained in the Psalms:
  1. The glorious Messiah (Pss. ii., xlv., lxxi., cix.).
  2. The suffering Messiah (Pss. xv., xxi., xxxix., xl., lxviii.).
- III. Prophecies among the Gentiles (Job xix. 21, 27).

## THIRD EPOCH: PROPHETISM.

- |                                   |                                |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. Joel ii. 28-32.                | 8. Jeremias ii. 21; iii. 1-19; |
| 2. Jonas (as type) ii. 1.         | xi. 19; xxiii. 1-8;            |
| 3. Amos ix. 11.                   | xxxi.; xxxiii.                 |
| 4. Osee i.-iii.; vi.; xi. 1;      | 9. Baruch iii. 24-38.          |
| xiii.                             | 10. Ezechiel xi. 14-21; xvii.  |
| 5. Micheas iv.-v.                 | 22-24; xxxiv. 20-31;           |
| 6. Isaias ii.-iv.; v.; vi.; vii.- | xxxvi. 16-32; xxxvii.          |
| ix.; xi.; xii.; xxviii.;          | 11. Daniel ii.; vii.; ix. 21-  |
| xxix. 14; xxxiii. 18;             | 27.                            |
| xxxv.; xl. 1-11; xl. 1-           | 12. Aggeus ii. 1-10.           |
| 9; xlix.; l.; lii.; liii.;        | 13. Zacharias ii. 8-13.; iii.; |
| liv., lv.; lix.; lx.; lxi.;       | vi. 9-15; ix.; xii.-xiv.       |
| lxiii. 1-6; lxv.; lxvi.           | 14. Malachias i. 10, 11; iii.  |
| 7. Nahum i. 15.                   | 1-6; iv. 5, 6.                 |

Appendix: Books immediately preceding the advent of Christ: I. Mach. iv. 46; xiv. 41; Wisd. ii. 11-20.

γ. FROM SOLOMON TO EZECHIAS.—Between Solomon and Ezechias intervened some two hundred years, during which the voice of prophecy was silent. The Messianic conception entertained at this time by the Jews may have been that of a king of the royal house of David, who should arise and gather under his peaceful sceptre both his own people and the Gentile nations. Sufficient allusion to his prophetic and priestly offices had been made to create thoughtful consideration; but as yet there was no clear



delineation of these Messianic characteristics. It was reserved for the prophets to bring out these features more distinctly.

δ. THE PROPHETS.—The seventeen prophets may be divided into four groups: 1. The prophets of the Northern Kingdom, 896–722 B.C. (641): Osee, Amos, Joel, Jonas; 2. The prophets of the Southern Kingdom, 889–588 B.C.: Isaias, Jeremias, Baruch, Abdias, Micheas, Nahum, Habacuc, Sophonias; 3. The prophets of the Captivity, 594–536 B.C.: Ezechiel and Daniel; 4. The prophets of the Return, 530–424 B.C.: Aggeus, Zacharias, Malachias. In this great period of prophecy there is no longer any chronological development of Messianic prophecy, as in the earlier period, previous to Solomon. Each prophet adds a feature, more or less clear. Combine the features, and we have a portrait. But it does no longer grow gradually and perceptibly under the hands of the several artists. Here then the task of tracing the chronological progress of the Messianic revelation comes to an end: its culminating point may be seen in the prophecy of Is. lii. 13–15 and liii. We here read of the Servant of God, lowly and despised, full of grief and suffering, oppressed, condemned as a malefactor, and put to death. But his sufferings are not for his own sake, for he had never been guilty of fraud or violence: they are spontaneously undergone, patiently borne, and vicarious in their nature; by God's special appointment they have an atoning, reconciling, and justifying efficacy. The result of his sacrificial offering is to be his exaltation and triumph. By the path of humiliation and expiatory suffering he is to reach the state of glory foreshown by David and Solomon. The prophetic character of the Messiah is described by Isaias in other parts of his book, as the atoning work is predicted in chapters lii. and liii.

ε. RESULT.—By the time of Ezechias, therefore,—for the theory of a Deutero-Isaias living in the days of the Captivity has never been satisfactorily established,—the portrait of the God-man, at once King, Priest, Prophet, and Redeemer,



had been drawn in all its essential features. The contemporary and later prophets added certain particulars and details (cf. Mich. v. 2; Dan. vii. 9; Zach. vi. 13; Mal. iv. 2), and then the conception was left to await its realization after an interval of some four hundred years from the date of the last Hebrew prophet.

ζ. DIVISION OF PROPHETICAL BOOKS.—The Jews divide the prophetical books into two classes, one of which contains the prophetical historical writings, the other the prophetical predictive ones. The first class embraces the books of Josue, Judges, I., II., III., IV. Kings; the later prophets, who constitute the second class, are divided into the Greater and the Lesser Prophets. Isaias, Jeremias, and Ezechiel are the Greater Prophets; Daniel, who is by us reckoned as a Greater Prophet, stands in the Hebrew text between Esther and Esdras. This position is owing to the exceptional character of his office (Smith, "Diction. of Bible," under *Baruch*; Hengstenberg, "Christology," ii.; Delitzsch, "Messian. Prophecy," etc.).

η. CHRONOLOGY OF THE PROPHETS.—Authorities do not agree concerning the chronological order of the prophets. A few probable chronological arrangements are exhibited in the following table:

LXX.						
<i>Hebr. Text.</i>	<i>Version.</i>	<i>De Wette.</i>	<i>Keil.</i>	<i>Stanley.</i>	<i>Calmet.</i>	<i>Period</i>
1. Osee.	Osee.	Joel.	Abdias.	Joel.	Osee.	c. 800.
2. Joel.	Amos.	Jonas.	Joel.	Jonas.	Amos.	.....
3. Amos.	Micheas.	Amos.	Jonas.	Osee.	Isaias.	c. 790.
4. Abdias.	Joel.	Osee.	Amos.	Amos.	Jonas.	c. 785.
5. Jonas.	Abdias.	Micheas.	Osee.	Isaias.	Micheas.	c. 725.
6. Micheas.	Jonas.	Nahum.	Micheas.	Micheas.	Nahum.	c. 710.
7. Nahum.	Nahum.	Sophonias.	Nahum.	Nahum.	Jeremias.	c. 640.
8. Habacuc.	Habacuc.	Habacuc.	Habacuc.	Zacharias.	Baruch.	c. 605.
9. Sophonias.	Sophonias.	Abdias.	Sophonias.	Sophonias.	Sophonias.	c. 570.
10. Aggeus.	Aggeus.	Aggeus.	Aggeus.	Habacuc.	Joel.	c. 520.
11. Zacharias.	Zacharias.	Zacharias.	Zacharias.	Abdias.	Daniel.	.....
12. Malachias.	Malachias.	Malachias.	Malachias.	Jeremias.	Ezechiel.	c. 440.
13. (The Greater Prophets are not in these lists.)				Ezechiel.	Habacuc.	
14.				Isaias.	Abdias.	
15.				Daniel.	Aggeus.	
16.				Aggeus.	Zacharias.	
17.				Zacharias.	Malachias.	
18.				Malachias.		

9. OTHER PROPHETS.—It must not, however, be imagined that the seventeen prophets enumerated were the only persons in the Old Testament who were endowed with the prophetic gift. According to St. Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* i. 21, M. 8, 869), there lived before the birth of Jesus Christ thirty-five prophets, including the five pre-Mosaic ones: Adam, Noe, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and five prophetesses: Sara, Rebecca, Mary the sister of Moses, Debbora, and Holda. The Jews themselves claim to have had forty-eight prophets and seven prophetesses (*Seder Olam* 21; cf. Bartolocci, *Biblioth. Rabb.* iii. p. 457; Calmet. *Prol. in Prophet.* 2); St. Epiphanius (*Fragm.*; cf. Cotelier, *Not. in Canon. Apost.* iv. 6) maintains that up to the time of Agabus (*Acts* xi. 28) there existed seventy-three prophets, and between Sara and the Blessed Virgin he enumerates ten prophetesses. Since it seems to be certain that from the time of Moses down to the time of Malachias there never failed a prophet in Israel to explain the Law to the people, and to prepare it for the coming Christian dispensation, we must hold with Cornely (*Introduct.*, II. ii. p. 280) that the true number of prophets is known to God alone. Only a few names are mentioned in Scripture besides the seventeen commonly enumerated, who are said to have had the prophetic spirit. Among these are: Gad and Nathan, Ahas and Addo, Semeias and Azarias, Hanani and Jehu, Jahaziel and Eliezer, Elias and Elisens, Oded and Urias, Holda and Debbora. The majority of the prophetic names have not come down to us, either because their bearers never wrote down their inspired predictions, or they played too insignificant a part in the history of the theocratic kingdom (cf. *I. Kings* iii. 1 ff.; x. 5 ff.; xix. 20 ff.; xxii. 5 ff.; *II. Kings* xxiv. 11 ff.; vii. 1 ff.; xii. 1 ff.; *III. Kings* i. 8 ff.; xi. 29 ff.; *I. Par.* xxix. 29; *II. Par.* ix. 29; *III. Kings* xii. 15; xiv. 1; xiii. 1 ff.; xii. 22 ff.; xvi. 1 ff.; xvii. 1-4; *II. Par.* xv. 1; etc.).

## CHAPTER III.

## NAME AND NATURE OF THE PROPHETS.

1. **VERBAL DEFINITION.**—*a.* **Greek Etymology.**—The meaning of the word prophecy in English is much narrower than that of *προφητεία* in Greek. Hence we must return to the original Greek meaning of the word, in order to obtain an accurate idea of what was meant by “prophets.” Eusebius (*Demonstratio Evang.* v. Proleg. M. 22, 345) derives the Greek *προφήτης* from *προφαίνειν*, to show beforehand, because God foreshows to the prophet what is to happen in the future. St. Thomas (*Summa Theol.* II<sup>a</sup>. ii<sup>ae</sup>., q. 171, a. 1) gives a similar derivation, compounding the word out of *προ* and *φάρος*, because to the prophet appears what is yet far off. Suarez rejects this etymology (*De fide disp.* viii. s. 3) as having no foundation in the Greek. He might have said the same about another derivation which St. Thomas has taken from St. Isidore (*Etymol.* vii. 8; M. 82, 283) and which also Sts. Basil (*Comm. in Is.* 102; M. 30, 284), Chrysostom (*In illud “Vidi Dominum.”* hom. 2, 3; M. 56, 111), and Gregory (*In Ezech.* i. hom. 1, 1; M. 76, 786) had adopted, explaining prophet from *προφάναι*, as a predictor of the future. The particle *προ* has, therefore, a temporal meaning in this explanation. Sts. Chrysostom (*Synops. S.S.*, M. 56, 317) and Gregory (*l. c.*), as well, as Theodoretus (*In Psalm. Præf.*; M. 80, 861), well understood that in reality the prophetic office was not limited to predicting the future. Cremer has suggested a local signification for the particle *προ* (*Bibl. Theol., Wörterbuch der neutestamentl. Gräcität*, ed. 4, Gotha, 1886, p. 826), so that “prophet” means any one speaking in public.

Others have suggested that *προφάναι* means in general "to speak," so that any speaker may be called a prophet. II. Stephanus (Lexic. ed. Hase and Dindorf, s. v.; vi. 2094; cf. Bleek Wellhausen, *Einleitung*, p. 308) is of opinion that where, in classical writers, interpretation is called prophecy, the preposition *πρὸ* is used instead of *ὑπό*; but such a substitution is by no means necessary in order to explain those passages. For as in *πρόβουλος*, *πρόδικός*, and other words the *πρὸ* signifies "instead of," so *προφήτης* denotes one who speaks instead of another, especially of a god (cf. Liddell and Scott, s. v.), thus explaining the will of that god. Hence the primary meaning of *προφήτης* is "interpreter." Apollo is called a prophet because he is the interpreter of Zeus (*Æsch. Eumen.* 19); poets are called prophets or interpreters of the muses (Plato, *Phæd.* 262 D); the priests attached to the temples are prophets, because they explain the oracles delivered by the unconscious and inspired *μαντις* (Plato, *Tim.* 72 B; Herod. vii. 111, note ed. Baehr).

**b. Hebrew Etymology.**—This may be called the classical use of the word *προφήτης*. If its biblical meaning be considered, we must keep in mind that it was introduced into the Testament version by the LXX. Now the LXX. translate *Nabi* (נָבִי) always, and *Roeh* (רֹאֶה) sometimes, by *προφήτης* (cf. I. Par. xxvi. 28; II. Par. xvi. 7, 10). Consequently, the latter expression has the meaning of the former. As to *Nabi*, it is uncertain whether it is an active, a passive, or an intransitive noun.

**α. INTRANSITIVE MEANING.**—Ewald, Fleischer, Delitzsch, König, Müllau, Volek, Briggs, and others maintain that the noun is intransitive. Their reasons may be reduced to the following: 1. *Nabi* is derived from the stem *Naba* (נָבַע, נָבֵעַ), which is not found in the active or the passive species, but only in the reflexive, either Niphal or Hithpaël. 2. *Nabi* is allied to *Nub* (נָבַח), which is used of the coming forth of fruit. Thus in Prov. x. 31: "The mouth of the just shall bring forth wisdom." 3. *Nabi* is similar

to the Arabic Naba'a, to rise up, to become audible, to proclaim, to name; Nabi is therefore a spokesman, or preacher (cf. Briggs, "Messianic Prophecy," p. 15, n. 2).

*β. PASSIVE MEANING.*—Tholuck, Gesenius, Kuenen, Hupfeld, Riehm, Schultz, Bunsen, Davidson, and others regard Nabi as a passive noun. The following are some of their reasons: 1. Naba, the stem of Nabi, is related to Naba "to boil up," "pour forth," so that the prophet is one caused to boil over with the divine word. 2. Rachash (רַחַשׁ) in Ps. xlv. 2 furnishes a similar expression for the utterance of a divinely inspired agent. 3. N'um (נֹּחַם) is a passive form, and has a meaning similar to Nabi. The opponents of the present view grant that N'um has a passive form and meaning, but they deny that Nabi is like it in form. 4. The Arabic Naba'a is more likely a denominative, and its stem-noun is derived from the Hebrew. Hence the Hebrew form Nabi must not be determined by means of the Arabic, but the Arabic must be investigated by means of the Hebrew. The opponents freely admit that this is a satisfactory solution of their argument based on the Arabic alone, but they claim that it does not explain the Assyrian form.

*γ. ACTIVE MEANING.*—Ewald, Hävernick, Öhler, Hengstenberg, Bleek, Lee, Pusey, McCaul, Fürst, Reinke, and others maintain that Nabi is an active form. They too have their special reasons: 1. The active sense of "announcing," "pouring forth the declaration of God," is more in accordance with the use of the word. The passive sense may describe the state of the prophet while inspired, but the active is descriptive of the prophetic office. 2. The stem must be derived from the root "Ba" (cf. Greek "fa," Latin "fari"), and the prefix Na. Hence the true meaning of Nabi is to "overcome one in speaking," "to convince" (cf. Elliott, "Old Test. Proph.," p. 21).

*c. Use of the Word:* *α. NABI.*—Exodus iv. 14-16 may be regarded as the classical passage giving the meaning of Nabi: "The Lord being angry at Moses, said: Aaron the

Levite is thy brother; I know that he is eloquent. Behold, he cometh forth to meet thee, and seeing thee shall be glad at heart. Speak to him, and put My words in his mouth, and I will be in thy mouth, and in his mouth, and will show you what you must do; he shall speak in thy stead to the people, and shall be thy mouth: but thou shalt be to him in those things that pertain to God."

If we compare Exodus vii. 1 with this passage, we shall gain a clear insight into the meaning of Nabi: "And the Lord said to Moses: Behold, I have appointed thee the God of Pharaoh, and Aaron thy brother shall be thy prophet." Hence Aaron is called the Nabi of Moses, because he shall speak in Moses' stead to the people, and shall be the mouth of Moses. It matters little whether the words that Moses will put into Aaron's mouth refer to the past, the present, or the future, or whether they contain universal truths abstracting from all time—in any case Aaron will be Moses' prophet.

β. ROEH AND CHOZEH.—The other word which the LXX. translate by *προφήτης* is Roeh. But Chozeh too, like Roeh, signifies "one who sees," and is often used in the Old Testament in this meaning. The three words Nabi, Roeh, Chozeh, seem to be contrasted with one another in I. Par. xxix. 29: "Now the acts of King David first and last are written in the book of Samuel the seer (Roeh), and in the book of Nathan the prophet (Nabi), and in the book of Gad the seer (Chozeh)." Roeh is a title almost appropriated to Samuel. It occurs eleven times in the Bible, and in seven of these instances it is applied to Samuel (I. Kings ix. 9, 11, 18, 19; I. Par. ix. 22; xxvi. 28; xix. 29), in two instances it applies to Hanani (II. Par. xvi. 7, 10), once it designates Sadoc (II. Kings xv. 27), and in Is. xxx. 10 it is not applied to any definite person. Roeh was superseded in its general use by the word Nabi, which Samuel, who is himself called Nabi, as well as Roeh (I. Kings iii. 20; II. Par. xxxv. 18), appears to have revived after a period of desuetude, and to have applied to the



prophets organized by him. The verb Raah, whence Roeh is derived, is the common prose-expression signifying "to see," while the verb Chazah, whence Chozeh is obtained, has a more poetic coloring. Chozeh rarely occurs outside the Books Paral., but Chazon regularly signifies vision.

γ. DIFFERENCE OF USE.—It has been much debated whether there is any difference in the usage of the three words, and in what that difference consists. The various opinions may be reduced to the following classes: 1. Hævernick (*Einleitung*, Th. 1, Abth. 1, p. 56) considers Nabi as the title of those who officially belonged to the prophetic order, but Roeh and Chozeh as designations of those who received a prophetic revelation. 2. Dr. Lee (*Inspiration of Holy Scripture*, p. 543) agrees with Hævernick as to the meaning of Nabi; Roeh he identifies with Nabi rather than with Chozeh in meaning, and Chozeh he explains as denoting a prophet especially attached to the royal house (II. Kings xxiv. 11; I. Par. xxi. 9; II. Par. xxix. 25). 3. Dean Stanley (*Lectures on the Jewish Church*, xxviii., xxix.) is of opinion that Roeh was the oldest name of the prophetic office, superseded by Nabi shortly after Samuel's time; Chozeh he represents as another antique title. We need hardly state that there is no sufficient ground for the latter opinion. On examination we find that Nabi existed before and after and alongside of both Roeh and Chozeh, but that Chozeh is a little more modern than Roeh. 4. Since there is nothing in the word Chozeh to denote the relation of the prophet to the king, and since a prophet appears to have been attached only to David, and possibly to Manasses (II. Par. xxxiii. 18), it would seem that the same persons are designated by the three words Nabi, Roeh, and Chozeh. The last two titles refer to the prophet's power of seeing the visions presented to him by God, the first to his function of revealing and proclaiming God's truth to men. This agrees with St. Gregory Nazianzen's description of Ezechiel: *ὁ τῶν μεγάλων ἐπόπτης καὶ ἐξηγητὴς μυστηρίων* (Or. 28).



δ. OTHER NAMES OF PROPHETS.—It may not be out of place to mention here a few of the other titles by which the prophets are designated in the Old Testament. The following seem to deserve special attention: “Malakh Jahveh” (מַלְאָךְ יְהוָה), or messenger of the Lord (Is. xlv. 26; Agg. i. 13; Mal. iii. 1), “ish elohim” (אִישׁ אֱלֹהִים), or man of God (I. Kings ii. 27; ix. 6), “‘bed Jahveh” (עֲבֹד יְהוָה), or servant of the Lord (Is. xx. 3; Am. iii. 7; Jer. vii. 25; xxv. 4 . . .), “ro‘eh” (רֹעֶה), or shepherd (Jer. xvii. 16; Zach. xi. 4), “shomer” (שֹׁמֵר), or guard (Is. lxii. 6; Hab. ii. 1), “tsopeh” (צֹפֶה), or scout (Am. iii. 6; Is. lvi. 10; Jer. vi. 17; Ezech. iii. 17 . . .), “bachon” (בַּחֲוֹן), or approver (cf. Zschokke, “Theologie der Propheten,” Freiburg, 1877, pp. 354 ff.). The reader hardly needs to be reminded that these names express nothing but the various aspects under which the prophet may be regarded.

2. DEFINITION FROM EFFECTS.—*a. New Testament.*—St. Paul (I. Cor. xiv. 3) has well summed up the prophetic functions and characteristics: “He that prophesieth,” the apostle says, “speaketh to men unto edification and exhortation and comfort.” Unto edification the prophets speak to men when as divinely inspired theologians they teach the people what to believe and what to do in order to insure their eternal salvation. Unto exhortation the prophets speak when they pour forth their powerful and efficacious pleadings in order to soften and move men’s hearts. Unto comfort finally do the prophets speak when they predict the future glory of the chosen people, and the rejection of the gentile world, the end of the Old Dispensation, and the approaching establishment of the Church. For the Law and the Prophets have their centre in Christ, so that prophecy is the figure of Christ as Christ is the fulfilment of prophecy (cf. Goldhagen, *Introductio*, ii. p. 354; a Lap., *In prophet. prooem.* iii.). Becanus (*Anal. V. et N. Test.*, viii. qu. 2) maintains that the primary end of the prophets is to teach and reform the people in the true worship of God,

and thus prepare them for the coming of Christ (cf. Paul Scholz, "Theol. d. A. B.," pp. 77 ff.; Knabenbauer, "Der Prophet Isaias," Freiburg, 1881, p. 5). Hence we may call the prophets the supreme and authentic teachers instituted by God to preserve, explain, and evolve the Mosaic covenant and to prepare the Christian dispensation.

**b. Old Testament.**—*α. PROPHETIC AUTHORITY EXTENDS TO ALL ISRAELITES.*—If this statement stands in need of any further proof, it may be confirmed from the Old Testament history. God says to Ezechiel (iii. 17–19): "Son of Man, I have made thee a watchman to the house of Israel, and thou shalt hear the word out of my mouth, and shalt tell it them from me. If when I say to the wicked: Thou shalt surely die, thou declare it not to him, that he may be converted from his wicked way and live: the same wicked man shall die in his iniquity, but I will require his blood at thy hand. But if thou give warning to the wicked, and he be not converted from his wickedness and from his evil way, he indeed shall die in his iniquity, but thou hast delivered thy soul." Consequently we find that the prophets exhorted and warned kings, priests, and the influential persons of their time with the same liberty with which they spoke of the waywardness of the poor and the lowly. Samuel announces the coming judgment to Heli and Saul, Elias faithfully fulfils his mission at the court of Achab, and similar instances from the Old Testament might be multiplied indefinitely (cf. I. Kings ii. 27: xiii. 10–14; xv. 12–30; II. Kings xii. 1 ff.; III. Kings xi. 29 f.; II. Par. xvi. 7; xix. 2; Is. i. 10 f.; vii. 1 ff.).

*β. EMBRACES PRIVATE MATTERS.*—The authority of the prophets not only extended over all the Israelites, but embraced also all the details of their private, public, and religious life. St. Jerome says that many examples prove the existence of the custom among the Jews to ask God by means of His prophets whatever they desired to know (In Ezech. xx. 1). Thus Saul asks Samuel concerning the lost asses, Jeroboam sends his wife to ask the prophet

Ahiah concerning his sick son, Ochozias is upbraided for consulting Beelzebub, the god of Aecaron, rather than Jehovah himself about the issue of his infirmity (cf. I. Kings ix. 3 ff.; III. Kings xiv. 1 ff.; IV. Kings i. 2 ff.; IV. Kings v. 15 ff.).

γ. POLITICAL AFFAIRS.—The influence of the prophets in affairs of state was much more important than their authority in private matters. Even after God had granted kings to his people, he himself retained the supreme authority over it. The prophets constantly watched that the kings might rule according to the divine law. Samuel elected the first king, wrote the constitution of the new kingdom, rejected the sovereign in the name of God, substituting David in his place; the prophets following Samuel are constantly engaged in directing and instructing David's successors. Nor was their office strictly limited to the kings of Israel. Foreign nations and rulers were at times the object of their prophetic warnings and threats (cf. Is. viii. 19; xxx. 2; Jer. xxxvii. 3; xlii. 2; i. 10; xxv. 15; xl.-li.; Is. ii. 7-9; xxxi. 1; viii. 6; xiii.-xxvii.; I. Kings viii. 4; x. 25; xv. 23-28; xvi. 1 ff.; III. Kings xii. 22 ff.; xiii. 1 ff.; xiv. 7 ff.; II. Par. xvi. 7 f.; xviii. 6; xix. 2 f.; xx. 14 ff.; xxv. 7; III. Kings xix. 15; IV. Kings viii. 10 ff.; Ezech. xxv.-xxxii.; Knabenb., Stimmen, 1880, xviii. p. 274).

δ. RELIGIOUS QUESTIONS.—Throughout their work it was the constant aim of the prophets to preserve and confirm the Mosaic covenant, and to prepare Israel for the new Christian dispensation. Hence their special care was always directed to the increase and the furtherance of the national religious life. Witness their constant war against idolatry, their incessant endeavor to stir up their fellow-citizens to the one true worship. At the same time they are not content with a merely external worship. They inculcate the principle that obedience is better than sacrifice, and that humility is more excellent than the fat of goats (I. Kings xv. 22 ff.). "Wash yourselves, be clean, take away

the evil of your devices from my eyes, cease to do perversely, learn to do well, seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge for the fatherless, defend the widow," such are the exhortations we find in the prophet *Isaias* (i. 16 f.). Meanwhile, it would be a mistake to think that the prophets neglected the observance of the ritual law or thought little of it. They repeatedly insist on this observance too, and even add new determinations and explanations of the law promulgated by Moses. "Blessed is the man," says *Isaias* (lvi. 2 ff.), "that doth this, and the son of man that shall lay hold on this: that keepeth the Sabbath from profaning it, that keepeth his hands from doing any evil." And again (lxvi. 17): "They that were sanctified and thought themselves clean in the gardens behind the gate within, they that did eat swine's flesh, and the abomination and the mouse; they shall be consumed together, saith the Lord" (cf. *Jer.* xvii. 20-27; xxxiii. 17 f.; xlv. 21; *Ezech.* xx. 12 ff.; xxii. 8; *IV. Kings* xvii. 13; iv. 23-42; *II. Par.* xxix. 25). But the most important function of the prophets in regard to the religious life was to increase the deposit of faith, and to keep the eyes of the pious Israelites on the glorious Messianic future, thus offering them consolation and strength to bear up under the heavy trials and national calamities which were constantly befalling them (cf. *Cornely*, *Introduct. U. T.* II. ii., pp. 271 ff.; *Elliott*, "Old Testament Prophecy," New York, 1889, pp. 26-28).

**3. DEFINITION FROM PSYCHOLOGICAL CONDITION OF THE PROPHET.**—Thus far we have drawn a description of the Old Testament prophets from the effect they were intended to produce on the Jewish nation. *Zachary* in his celebrated hymn of thanksgiving has well described the moral effects produced by the prophets on their contemporaries (*St. Luke* i. 76-79): "And thou child shalt be called the prophet of the Highest; for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways, to give knowledge of salvation to his people, unto the remission of

their sins, through the bowels of the mercy of our God, in which the Orient from on high hath visited us, to enlighten them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, to direct our feet into the way of peace." It is now incumbent on us to describe the Old Testament prophets according to the physical condition in which they received the divine communications, referring either to the future or to the present.

**a. Purely Intellectual or Sensible.**—From what has been said thus far, it is plain that prophecy is a supernatural fact, i.e.—a fact tending, at least indirectly, to a supernatural end. But this of itself does not throw much light on the psychological condition of the prophet while he is under the divine inspiration. St. Thomas (II<sup>a</sup>. ii<sup>ae</sup>., q. 174, a. 2, 3) and Suarez (III<sup>a</sup>. pars, q. 30, a. 4, disp. ix., sect. 2) tell us that prophecy is either purely intellectual or sensible. In the former case, the prophetic communication is given directly to the intellect without the intervention of any sensible image. This seems to happen very rarely, and in the Sacred Scriptures we know of no other instance except that of St. Paul (II. Cor. xii. 2): "I know a man in Christ above fourteen years ago—whether in the body, I know not, or out of the body, I know not—God knoweth—such an one rapt even to the third heaven."

**b. Seven Kinds of Sensible Prophecy.**—The second manner of prophetic inspiration, or that by means of a sensible medium, is subdivided by St. Thomas into seven classes: The first is ecstasy or spiritual rapture, such as we find in St. Peter when he saw the linen cloth filled with the divers kinds of animals; the second is vision, as we find in the case of the prophet Isaias, where he says: "I saw the Lord sitting"; the third class is the prophetic dream, as Jacob had when in his sleep he saw the miraculous ladder (Gen. xxii. 12); the fourth is the miraculous cloud, such as appeared to Moses; the fifth is the voice from heaven, like that which Abraham heard when about to sacrifice his son Isaac (Gen. xxii. 12); the sixth is the parable, such

as Balaam received (Num. xxiii. 7): the seventh is the condition of being filled with the Holy Spirit, as were nearly all the prophets. Though this division is very ingenious, it is not altogether satisfactory. The seventh class, e.g., seems to embrace all the other six; the distinction between vision and ecstasy is hard to draw for one who does not know the difference by experience. Perhaps the following classification will be found more intelligible, since it reduces the seven kinds of sensible prophecy to three.

*α. WORDS.*—There is in the first place the prophetic communication by means of words (cf. Vigouroux, "*Manuel Biblique*," t. i. pp. 461 ff.; Trochon, "*Introduction générale*," p. xii.). Not as if there were always question of articulate language striking the prophet's bodily ear, but there is, at least, an internal voice, or the sensation representing certain articulate sounds. Many divine communications happened in this manner, though in a number of instances (I. Kings iii. 4; Ex. iii. 4, etc.) really articulate sound seems to have existed.

*β. VISIONS.*—The second manner of sensible prophetic communication is the vision, instances of which occur frequently in the prophets, especially in the case of Ezechiel (i. 4; ii. 9; viii. 2; x. 1; xxxvii. 1; xl. 2; Is. vi. 2, etc.). If it be asked in what these visions consisted, there is a diversity of opinion. Some think that in the case of visions the prophet was really acted upon by external objects, i.e., God produced the objects which the prophet saw outside of the prophet. Others are of opinion that in case of vision God produced the sensation only in the prophet's interior, so that nothing external corresponded with the prophetic vision. St. Jerome embraces this second opinion (*M. Patrol. Lat.* t. xxv. col. 347), where he speaks of Ezechiel's well-known vision of the dry bones. "*Eduxit eum in spiritu, non in corpore, sed extra corpus*" are the words of the holy Doctor. In any case, the visions of the prophets were not mere fictions, but they were really



produced by God, either interiorly (directly) or by means of external objects (indirectly) (cf. Vigouroux, l. c., p. 462; Cornely, "Introduct." II. ii. pp. 291 f.).

1. *Views of Philo, etc.*—Here the question arises whether the prophets, when actually seeing the prophetic visions or hearing the prophetic words, were always in a state of unconsciousness. Philo and the Alexandrian school answer in the affirmative. "The human understanding," says Philo (*Quis rerum divin. hæc.*, t. i. p. 511), "leaves when the divine spirit arrives, and when the latter leaves the former returns to its home; for the mortal must not dwell with the immortal." The same writer (*De vita Mosis*, l. i. t. ii. p. 124) describes Balaam as an unconscious instrument through which God spoke to men. In the writings of Josephus (*Antiq.* IV. vi.) Balaam excuses himself before Balak on a similar principle. Prophecy is by these writers altogether identified with the pagan soothsaying. The Montanists adopted the same view of prophecy, as we see from the writings of Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* iv. 22): "We hold that an ecstasy of grace, i.e., unconsciousness, is part of the new prophecy. For man constituted in spirit, especially when he sees the divine glory, or when God speaks through him, necessarily loses his sensibility, being overshadowed by the divine power; and about this there is a difference of opinion between us and the Psychists [Catholics]." And according to this view of Philo, the pagan philosophers, and the Montanists, the so-called ecstasy lasted not only while the divine communication was made, but also while the prophet communicated the same to man.

2. *This Theory Rejected.*—The Fathers of the Church are unanimous in combating this view of the prophetic state. Miltiades composed a whole book against it (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* v. 17); Origen and St. Basil insist on the difference between the prophet and the unconscious soothsayer; St. Jerome (*In Nahum*, prooem.) says: "The prophet does not speak in ecstasy, as Montanus, Prisca,



and Maxillima insanely maintain, but what he prophesies he fully understands." And again, the same Saint says (In 1s. prooem.): "The prophets did not, as Montanus with his insane women dreams, speak in ecstasy, so as not to understand their own words, and remain ignorant while instructing others." St. Chrysostom (Hom. xxix. in epist. ad Corinth.) is still more explicit: "This is the peculiarity of the "mantis" (μάντις), to be beside himself, to suffer constraint, to be struck, to be stretched, to be dragged like a madman. The prophet, however, is not so, but he speaks everything with calm understanding and with sound self-possession, and knowing what he proclaims, so that we can distinguish between the mantis and the prophet even before the fulfilment."

3. *The Prophets Passive in their Visions.*—At the same time the Fathers use very clear and forcible terms to show that the prophets were passive under the divine inspiration, though they make a clear distinction between heathen soothsaying and Montanist ecstasy on the one side and Hebrew prophecy on the other. Thus the Fathers describe the prophets as passive instruments, as a flute (Athenagoras, Leg. pro Christianis, c. ix.; Clement of Alex., Cohort. ad Gent. c. i.), or a lyre (Justin Martyr, Cohort. ad Græcos, c. viii.; Ephrem. Syr., Rhythm. xxix.; Chrysost., ad popul. Antioch., Hom. i. t. ii.), or a pen (St. Gregory the Great, Præf. in Mor. Job). Expressions such as these (many of which are collected by Dr. Lee, Appendix G) must be set against the passages which were directed against the Montanists. The biblical account of the individual prophets confirms this view of the patristic writers. Jonas and Ezechiel even resist and struggle against the divine communication, but still they finally act according to their impulse from on high.

γ. DREAMS.—The third manner of sensible prophetic communication is the dream; it differs from the vision, because the latter happens in the waking state, while the former takes place in the sleep. What is told us of Nathan (11. Kings

vii. 4) shows that the vision may be had during the night-time. Instances of divine communication in the dream occur repeatedly in the Old Testament (Gen. xx. 3-6; xxviii. 12-14; I. Kings xxviii. 6; Joel ii. 28; Dan. ii.; Job xxxiii. 14-16). Even the gift of interpreting dreams is represented as a special favor of God, which the false prophets pretended at times to possess (Jer. xxiii. 25, 27, 28). It is surprising how any one can confound the vision with the dream as Smith (Dictionary of the Bible, see *Prophet*) seems to do.

δ. ECSTASY NOT EXCLUDED.—By classifying the sensible prophetic communication as hearing, seeing, and dreaming, we do not wish to exclude the ecstatic state from the possible conditions in which the prophet may find himself at the time he receives the divine communication. Such a state seems to be described in Job (iv. 13-16; xxxiii. 15), and more plainly in the Book of Daniel. In the case of Daniel we find first a deep sleep (viii. 18; x. 9) accompanied by terror (viii. 17; x. 8). Next, he is raised up (viii. 18) on his hands and knees, and then on his feet (x. 10, 11). He then receives the divine revelation (viii. 19; x. 12), after which he falls to the ground in a swoon (x. 15, 17); he is faint, sick, and astonished (viii. 27; cf. Smith, "Dictionary of the Bible," see *Prophet*). We may compare with this description the state of the apostles at the transfiguration, of St. Peter before the divine commission to receive the Gentiles into the Church (Acts x. 10; xi. 5), of St. Paul when he was commanded to devote himself to the conversion of the Gentiles (Acts xxii. 17), and again when he was caught up into the third heaven (II. Cor. xii. 1); finally of St. John when he received his message for the seven churches (Apoc. i. 10). But while we fully grant the possibility that a prophet may be in such a supernatural state when he receives his message, we at the same time maintain that the message itself is communicated to him as a vision, or as an audible voice, or as a dream, unless it be purely intellectual.

6. **PROPHETIC CERTAINTY.**—It may be asked: How did the prophets know that what they saw or heard or dreamed was a divine message, and not an illusion of the evil spirit or a mere hallucination? Have not even the most devout and upright persons been thus deluded? We understand that the question is not answered by the fact that the same difficulty exists in every divine inspiration, and especially in the inspiration, properly so called, under which the canonical books of the Old and the New Testament were written. But without answering the question fully, the parallel case at least illustrates what may have happened in case of the prophetic communications. A moral certainty that our inspiration is good, that our motive is supernatural, is a sufficient reason for performing the action in question and for following the inspiration. Add to this the supernatural certainty which the divine light of prophecy infuses into the mind of the prophet, and at the same time the powerful impulse given to his will to announce his divine message, and the earnest conviction with which the prophets speak is sufficiently explained. In case the prophet were endowed with the gift of working miracles in confirmation of his mission, he might even rely on this extrinsic motive for the truth of his prophetic announcements.

4. **RATIONALISTIC THEORIES.**—After establishing our own position regarding the psychological condition of the prophet at the time of his receiving the divine communication, we may cast a glance at the explanations that some of our opponents give of this same condition. The theories of Ewald, Réville, Kuenen, and, in short, of all those who reduce the prophetic state to a merely natural phenomenon, need not be considered. For it appears from the analysis of the prophetic argument that the prophetic light surpasses all natural causes, and can therefore proceed from God alone, either mediately or immediately. Whatever moral power these writers may ascribe to the prophets, however they may land their creation of ethical mono-

theism, they explain all this as a purely natural process, founded on the natural endowment of the prophets, and proving nothing beyond a great power of intellect and will. At the same time, these writers must shut their eyes to all the supernatural phenomena of prediction and fulfilment which are related in the Bible history. This position has been already sufficiently considered in a previous chapter.

*a. Briggs' Theory.*—Here we must draw attention to the position of a few Christian writers who fully admit that the prophetic phenomenon is supernatural, but do not seem to explain it satisfactorily, or at least they allow their explanations to be influenced by the claims of the rationalists. Prof. Briggs (*Messianic Prophecy*, New York, 1886, pp. 2-22) gives the following exposition of our question. 1. "Prophecy as a religious instruction claims to come from God and to possess divine authority. The prophet is an officer of the Deity, with a commission from the God he serves." It appears from the whole text that this description is intended to apply to any prophet, whether true or false, whether serving the true God or an idol. Here the rationalistic spirit which places the pagan religions of antiquity on a level with the revealed religion, and the soothsayers of paganism on a level with the prophets of Jehovah, has moved Dr. Briggs to call pagan soothsaying and Hebrew prophecy by the same name. He might as well give the same generic definition of gold and brass, of the picture and the object.

2. Then Dr. Briggs goes on to say that "there are three phases of prophecy which are common to the religions of the world—the dream, the vision, and the enlightened spiritual discernment." Here again the three kinds of prophecy which we have already described are placed on the same level with their counterfeits. That the Doctor actually does this is plain from what he says in the following paragraph: "The dream is the simplest phase of prophecy. It may arise from an abnormal condition of the body,

or from the stimulation of a higher power. It may be genuine prophecy or spurious prophecy. There is need of discriminating tests." In a similar manner does the writer speak about his second phase of prophecy, the vision: "The most common phase of prophecy is the ecstatic state. This may be either natural, as in epileptics and persons who through nervous derangement have an abnormal intellectual and emotional development, or artificial, where the nervous organization is excited by external stimulants, or the agency of evil spirits, or the divine Spirit." Finally, even the third phase of prophecy which Dr. Briggs acknowledges is of a very equivocal nature. "There is also a higher order of prophets, who through retirement and contemplation of the sacred mysteries of religion have been spiritually enlightened to discern truths of a higher order than their fellows, and to experience emotions of a deeper and more absorbing intensity. They have wondrous powers of insight and forecast. They read and interpret character and affairs. They are the masters of the past and the present, and they point the way confidently into the future. Such prophets of a higher grade exist among the various religions of the world." In all the three phases of prophecy, therefore, Dr. Briggs confounds the divinely inspired knowledge of the future with pagan divination and with natural penetration of genius.

3. In the third place, Dr. Briggs states the Montanistic view and the naturalistic theory of prophecy. The former is by no means refuted by him, but merely described and developed. In the course of development we meet the strange statement: "The most primitive form of prophecy among the Hebrews was doubtless of the lowest phases—external revelations through dreams or in ecstatic vision" (p. 14). As if in the divine revelations there were a development from the less to the more perfect way of communicating with man, or as if man himself had been in the beginning much less developed in his spiritual faculties than he was at a later period. The biblical account of man's

condition in the garden of Eden is here, at least implicitly, called in question.

4. Finally, the Doctor gives his description of the Hebrew prophet. "The prophet of Jahveh is personally called and endowed by Jahveh with the prophetic spirit. He speaks in the name of Jahveh and in his name alone. He is one of a series of prophets who guide in the development of the Hebrew religion. He absorbs and reproduces previous prophecy. He transmits prophecy with confidence to his successors. Hebrew prophecy is an organism of redemption." All this does not yet touch the point we are considering just now. It merely describes or defines the Hebrew prophet by means of the effect he produces. But it is interesting as fitting in closely with the following description of the prophetic call and endowment: "Hebrew prophecy originates in a personal revelation of God to man in theophany. It is communicated to successive prophets by the influence of the spirit of God. The divine Spirit assures the prophet of his possession of the truth of God and of his commission to declare it; endows him with the gifts and spiritual energy to proclaim it without fear or favor, and despite every obstacle; guides him in the form of its delivery, and directs him to give it its appropriate place in the prophetic system." The point in which this description agrees with the preceding concerns the organic connection in which every Hebrew prophet is supposed to stand with his predecessors and his successors—a connection that can by no means claim the undisputed certainty of a fact. This will appear clearly where we shall treat of the prophetic order and the schools of the prophets. What the author requires for the prophetic call and endowment besides this organic connection is so vague that it is hardly worth considering. Of course, there is the light for the intellect and the strength for the will; but then these are gifts that are bestowed in common inspiration too, so that according to this view the prophet hardly differs from the common canonical writer.



**b. Riehm's Theory.**—Riehm's explanation of prophecy, too, deserves a few moments' reflection (Messianic Prophecy, transl. by Muirhead, Edinburgh, 1891, pp. 1-101). 1. First, then, Riehm protests: "We also are persuaded that an historical understanding of Old Testament prophecy is impossible apart from a recognition of the reality of the divine revelations imparted to the prophets" (p. 14). The supernatural character of prophecy is therefore acknowledged by the author. What is meant by the historical understanding of prophecy is well illustrated by Davidson in the Introduction to Riehm's "Messianic Prophecies" (p. 12): "He who in a temple that is an acknowledged architectural masterpiece does not survey the structure as a whole may easily look for more beauty and perfection of form in the details than they by themselves really possess. The spectator, however, who admires the whole building need have no scruple in acknowledging the imperfections, in their isolated character, of details which make the temple great and splendid only by their co-ordination and harmonious articulation. One who in like manner has gained an insight into and a view of the whole Old Testament economy, and has, as a consequence, attained a full and clear conviction that the Old Covenant, as a whole, has been planned with a view to a future fulfilment in the New, and that the whole trend of religious development in the Old Testament is towards Christianity, will, in the exegesis of all particular Messianic passages, without scruple recognize only that measure of knowledge of God's saving purpose which, when examined according to the rules of a strictly historical method of exegesis, they are found really to contain." And previously the same author had defined the historical sense of prophecy as "the purport of individual utterances considered as members of the entire developing body of Old Testament prophecy" (p. 7). A few lines further on, we read: "A definition of the contents of a prophecy can include only the sense—albeit the full sense—in which at the time of its utterance the prophecy could



be understood, and was necessarily understood. For what can be recognized only in the time of fulfilment is precisely what is not contained in the prophecy itself."

2. After thus professing his belief in the supernatural character of prophecy, Riehm goes on to explain God's way of communicating his revelation to the prophets. "To assume," he says (p. 58), "that revelations were made to the prophets in a way that condemned their previous apprehensions of truth to absolute disuse involves surely an unworthy conception of God. . . . He [God] rather makes it his function to develop the germs that lie concealed in existing apprehensions, to bring them by constant impulse to the point at which they shall discover their hidden treasures, and cause the new truth organically to blossom forth from them under the reciprocal action of those influences which by the laws of their own life-force they exert upon one another in the natural progress of their development. . . . The question as to the origin of a Messianic prophecy is answered in a truly satisfactory way only when it is shown how that origin has been psychologically mediated, or more particularly, what roots and germs of it were contained in the previous consciousness of the prophet, and in what way it was organically developed from them." This principle is illustrated by a fact of animal life. As no nourishment can be taken into the animal system that has not previously an organic formation, so in the intellectual life no truth can be digested, as it were, that has not previously conformed to the preliminary conditions of its natural development in the faculty.

3. If it be asked in the third place which are the germinal ideas from which the Messianic prophecies have been organically developed, Dr. Riehm answers (p. 66): "There are three ideas which, above others, demand our special attention: the idea of the Covenant, the immediately related idea of the kingdom of God, and, as the germ of the Messianic prophecy in the narrower sense, the idea, not indeed, Mosaic, yet still pre-prophetic, of the theocratic kingship."

The author then shows how the prophecies may have been developed out of these three primary ideas. As to the idea of the Covenant, the Messianic prophecy in the wider sense resulted, firstly, from the contradiction between idea and reality consequent upon Israel's various disloyalties, and secondly, from the contradiction between idea and reality inherent in the entire character of the Old Covenant and its theocracy (p. 78). The same two contradictions between idea and reality would tend to evolve the Messianic prophecy out of the idea of the kingdom of God (pp. 90, 91). And if we regard the theocratic kingship, we find that the king is on the one hand the representative of the invisible and Divine King, and on the other he is also the representative of the people; hence he represents not merely the ideal prophet and judge, but also the ideal priest. And since reality was lagging far behind the idea, it is but natural that the Messianic prophecy in its narrower sense should evolve out of the theocratic kingship (p. 117 ff.).

4. It logically follows that the single Old Testament prophecies according to Riehm's view must be strictly adapted to the times in which they originated. This the author shows, first, from the destination of the prophecies for their respective present; secondly, from the limits of the prophetic prospect. Every prophet had a definite prophetic horizon beyond which his ideas could not carry him. Thirdly, from the fact that the circumstances of the relative times had to unfold the germs of the Messianic apprehension; and finally, from the general parallelism between the course of history of the kingdom of God and the development of the Messianic prophecy (Riehm, *l. c.*, part ii., pp. 124-217).

5. In the third part of his book (pp. 217-324) Riehm treats of the relation between Old Testament prophecy and New Testament fulfilment. He first reminds us again of his distinction between the contents of prophecy, i.e., the sense in which the prophets understood their utterances, and its ultimate reference to fulfilment through Christ (p.

219). The author regards the attempt to piece together in one complete picture all the individual features of Messianic prophecy, and to find in Christ and his kingdom the fulfilment of every individual feature, as unwarrantable and impracticable (p. 221). The single prophecies are not the fragments of a picture, but rather the different forms of a living organism, which advances through a series of phases of development. As individual leaves fall from the plant and are replaced by new ones, and as in the development of brute-organism every organ assumes just the form in which at that particular state of development it can best fulfil its intended purpose, so it is with the Messianic prophecies. The importance of individual prophecies is limited to the time during which the circumstances that evoked them continue, and during which the historical stage of development lasts to which the prophecy belongs. When the historical circumstances were substantially altered, most elements of the prophecy had found their proper times-adapted fulfilment, and so far as this was not the case, they could never be fulfilled in the sense which contemporaries gave to the prophecy. Hence, as soon as the circumstances have substantially altered, something new takes the place of the old that has been outlived and has lost its significance and effective force. Thus a very considerable portion of Messianic prophecy remains outside the sphere of New Testament fulfilment, either because it has found already its times-adapted fulfilment before the fulness of time, or through its remaining altogether unfulfilled.

*c. Verdict on Riehm's Theory.*—*α.* IT IS BASED ON A FALSE PRINCIPLE.—Regarding Riehm's theory we must say that it appears to us altogether unsatisfactory and even inconsistent. For the author claims on the one hand that God's intervention in prophecy is absolutely necessary, and on the other he establishes a gradual development of the prophetic ideas, similar to the gradual process in the vegetable and the animal life. Of course, he admits the latter, because according to him God could not reveal any truth

to man that is not already contained in what man knows beforehand. Now this position is in the first place entirely gratuitous. The analogy from the lower life proves only that our intellectual faculty cannot grasp anything that is not essentially related to it; but all truth is essentially related to the intellect, as philosophers prove. As it stands, the argument would prove that no animal can assimilate any food that is not already contained in its stomach,—cannot, in other words, take any fresh nourishment.

*β.* ITS ASSUMPTIONS ARE GRATUITOUS.—And when we come to examine the single stages of Riehm's theory, its entire gratuitousness and sophistry become evident. For, to begin with the starting-point of the theory, we are asked to assume the three ideas of the Covenant, the Kingdom of God, and the Theocratic Kingdom. Now these three ideas are either mere natural developments of previous concepts, in which case the whole superstructure is a merely natural system of religion, or they are directly revealed by God. But if this latter explanation be given, Riehm's own theory of the intellectual development of religious ideas falls to the ground.

*γ.* THE PROCESS OF DEVELOPMENT IS MERELY NATURAL.—In the next place, a word may be said about the development of the prophetic concepts out of the previous germinal ideas. As the process is explained, it excludes anything we might be apt to call a supernatural divine assistance. For we find similar processes in the development of almost every scientific or ethical idea. The gradual perfection in the application of steam and electricity which has now produced the transatlantic steamer and the telegraphic cable might thus be represented as a prophetic process, prefiguring our present state of mechanical perfection. In the same manner the revolutionary ideas developed during the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, culminating in the murder of Louis XVI. with its concomitant horrors, might be called

prophecies of the French Revolution. For as the horrors perpetrated by the revolutionists far outran the principles laid down by the revolutionary philosophy, so has, according to Riehm, the Christian fulfilment surpassed the prophetic predictions of the Messias.

δ. THE DEFINITENESS OF THE PROPHECIES IS NOT EXPLAINED.—Then it must be noted that the historical events which, according to Riehm's theory, developed the prophetic germs into fuller growth are by no means sufficient to account for the definite Messianic predictions which they produced. Take, for instance, the prophecy of Isaias vii. 1-14: the desire of King Achaz to conclude an alliance with Assyria is the occasion of Isaias' appeal to the king to place his confidence in the God of Israel. Achaz's rejection of the divine alliance and his preference for Assyrian help sufficiently account for the unfavorable sign that the prophet announces to the house of David: the crown and the glory of the house of David, the Messias, shall be reduced to the food of the poor, shall eat butter and honey, and the king of Assyria, who is preferred before God Almighty, shall become the instrument of Juda's scourge. Thus far the predictions correspond exactly with the historic occasion on which they were pronounced, though mere human wisdom could have by no means evolved them out of the previous concepts of Covenant and 'Theocratic Kingdom. But then, where was the need of predicting precisely on this occasion that a virgin should conceive and bear a son, and that the son's name was to be Emmanuel? What is true in the case of this particular prophecy applies to all the other prophecies, from the victory predicted for the seed of the woman even to the description of the Messias' vicarious suffering as contained in the prophet Isaias.

ε. THE IDEA OF FULFILMENT IS DESTROYED.—Finally, Riehm's view about the fulfilment of the Messianic prophecies is even less satisfactory than his opinion concerning their origin and development. It may be all very well to

omit in a steam-engine all superfluous wheels and screws, though they have been present at some past period when the machine was not yet fully developed; but, surely, no one will or can maintain that the various stages of the machine's growth were real prophecies of what we see at present. If Riehm perseveres in the system which he now holds about the Christian fulfilment of Messianic prophecy, he must either cease to speak about prophecy in connection with this subject, or he must change his definition of prophecy. Delitzsch's remark, therefore, that Riehm does not do justice to the literal meaning of the Messianic predictions must be understood in this sense: that Riehm abandons such a meaning entirely with regard to the great bulk of prophetic writings. It may be a depressing observation, but it is true, nevertheless, that Judaism has a strong support in such writers as Riehm. Why should a son of Abraham leave his particular set of views and opinions, naturally developed out of the Old Testament Messianic ideas, in order to adopt a set of religious ideas and opinions that have grown from the same root in another portion of the world, or in another school of religious teachers? The Jew, too, may point to that part of fulfilled prophecy which found its completion before the fulness of time; the Jew may claim that the Messianic prophecies not yet fulfilled were never intended to find their fulfilment, but were like the numberless leaves that fall from the plant as soon as they have attained their special end. Surely every Christian as such, however he may understand the relation of the divine to the human in the person of Jesus, must recognize in him the unmistakable end of Old Testament development, and in Christianity the infallible completion of Israel's religion.



## CHAPTER III.

## THE PROPHETIC OFFICE.

**1. THE EXERCISE OF THE PROPHETIC OFFICE WAS EXTRAORDINARY.**—It follows from the condition of the prophet at the time he receives the divine message that the exercise of his office is not an ordinary or common action. "The prophetic light," says St. Thomas (*Summa*, II<sup>a</sup>. ii<sup>ae</sup>., q. 171 a. 2), "is not in the intellect after the manner of a permanent form, . . . but as a transient passion or impression." And St. Jerome says (*In Ezech.* xxxv. 1. M. 25, 349): "If the word of God were always in the prophets and had a permanent dwelling in their breast, Ezechiel would not say so often: And the word of the Lord came to me." In point of fact, we repeatedly find the prophets praying for the divine light of prophecy, and at times they are even commanded to pray with this intention (*I. Kings* viii. 8; *Jer.* xxxii. 16; xlii. 4; *Dan.* ii. 17 ff.; ix. 3 ff.; *Jer.* xxxii. 2 f.).

**2. THE CALL TO THE PROPHETIC OFFICE WAS EXTRAORDINARY.**—If we consider the way in which the prophets were called, their office must again be called extraordinary. For it was God himself who called the individual prophets (*cf.* *I. Kings* iii. 1; *Is.* vi.; *Jer.* i.) and conferred on them the prophetic gift by an internal and supernatural process. The prophetic office was not, like the office of king or priest, annexed to a certain tribe or family or class of persons. Men and women of every age, of every condition of life, were fit subjects for the prophetic office. The boy Samuel was a Levite; Eliseus, a husbandman of the tribe of Ephraim, was advanced in age at the



time of his prophetic call; Isaias is by many believed to have belonged to the royal family; Amos was a shepherd of the tribe of Juda; Jeremias and Ezechiel were priests; Debhora was a prophetess at the time of the Judges, and King Josias sought the will of God from the prophetess Holda. Not even a definite preparation was required for the prophetic office, though we believe that it was commonly conferred on the pious and faithful observers of the law. No external rite initiated the prophets into their high office; for what we read of Elias and Elisens (III. Kings xix. 16) must be regarded as an exceptional case, and Isaias (lxi. 1) speaks of an internal unction of the Spirit.

**a. The Prophetic Order and the Prophetic Gift are not Convertible Terms.**—The opinion of recent biblical scholars that there existed regular schools of prophets seems at first sight to contradict our present position regarding the manner of the prophetic call. But it must be observed, in the first place, that even if we grant all that is said about the schools of prophets, our own thesis remains intact. For it is generally granted that the prophetic order and the prophetic gift are not convertible terms. The members of the schools might belong to the prophetic order, but they had not on that account the supernatural prophetic gift; and, on the other hand, there might be persons endowed with the prophetic gift who did not belong to the order or to the school of the prophets. The prophetic gift which constituted the prophet in the strict acceptation of the term, as we take it here, was always conferred by God himself. The prophetic gift may be compared with the gift of ecstacy or the prayer of quiet; persons may belong to communities in which this gift is often found, without possessing it; and again, ecstacy and the highest form of prayer may exist outside of religious communities.

**b. Prophetic Schools.**—But the opinion itself that there existed regular prophetic schools deserves a moment's attention. All we know for certain is that at the time of Samuel, of Elias and Elisens many prophets gathered at Ramatha,

Bethel, Gilgal, Jericho, and near the Jordan (I. Kings x. 5; xix. 20; IV. Kings. ii. 3, 5; iv. 38) around a more renowned prophet (Samuel, Elias, Elisens), whom they recognized as their superior (I. Kings xix. 20; IV. Kings. vi. 1), in order to lead a common life (IV. Kings. iv. 38 ff.) and give joint praise to God (I. Kings xix. 20). Then again the prophet Amos mentions the sons of the prophets (Am. vii. 14). And St. Jerome (Ad Rustic. ep. 125, 7; cf. ad Paulin. ep. 58, 5; ad Eustoch. ep. 22, 21; M. 22, 1076; 583; 408) writes: "The sons of the prophets of whom we read are the monks of the Old Testament, who built themselves huts along the Jordan, and having left the turmoil of the cities, lived on barley and wild herbs."

α. REASONS FOR THEIR EXISTENCE.—But not content with these facts, the modern investigators have devised regular systems of schools to which the prophets are said to have belonged. The reasons for this theory may be reduced to the following: 1. Abarbanel writes: "These [the sons of the prophets] are the disciples who prepare themselves for prophesying, and they are set apart and as Nazarenes consecrated for the divine service." 2. The sons of the prophets are said to sit before a more renowned prophets (IV. Kings iv. 38; vi. 1), as the pupils were wont to sit around their master (cf. Dillmann, Schenkel's Bibellexic. iv. p. 619; Davidson, Introd. ii. p. 457). 3. The Chaldee translation speaks already of a number of *scribes* (I. Kings x. 5, 10) sitting in a *house of learning* (I. Kings xix. 20), and mentions the *disciples* of the prophets instead of their sons (III. Kings xx. 32).

β. REASONS NOT CONVINCING.—But, on the other hand, it is urged that Abarbanel speaks in the foregoing manner on account of the Chaldee translation; that the latter introduces the terms "scribes" and "disciples" and "house of learning" without sufficient reason, substituting them for the familiar scriptural words "prophets" and "sons of the prophets." Besides, the very disciples who are said to prepare themselves for prophesying actually prophesy

already (III. Kings xx. 35; IV. Kings ii. 3, 5). And to base the whole theory of the prophetic schools on the fact that the sons of the prophets sit before their superior is to proceed unscientifically, to say the least.

γ. SCHOOLS INVOLVED IN UNCERTAINTY.—Still, if we grant that regular prophetic schools were organized, the historical books of the Old Testament speak only incidentally of them. Thus we do not know whether the prophets that played such an important part in the history of Saul and David continued to exist after the time of those kings; again, we know that king Achab was a persecutor of the sons of the prophets, that they existed at the time of Elias and Eliseus, and that they were extinct when the books of Machabees and of Ecclesiasticus were written (I. Mac. iv. 46; ix. 27; xiv. 41; Ecclus. xxxvi. 17). Whether their existence was continuous or interrupted, whether they lasted till about the period when the canon of the Old Testament received its last additions, or ended at the time of Elias and Eliseus must remain an historical problem (Trochon, "*Introd. générale aux Prophètes*," Paris, 1883, p. xxx.).

δ. PROBABLE DESCRIPTION OF THE SCHOOLS.—The probable existence of the prophetic schools being admitted, their organization is at best but conjectural. The colleges appear to have differed considerably in the number of their members; some must have been quite numerous (III. Kings xviii. 4; IV. Kings ii. 16). An elderly or leading prophet presided over them (I. Kings xix. 20), called their Father (I. Kings x. 12) or Master (IV. Kings ii. 3), who may have been admitted to his office by the ceremony of anointing (III. Kings xix. 16; Is. lxi. 1; Ps. civ. (cv.) 15). The members of the college were called his sons. The chief subject of study was no doubt the Law and its interpretation. Subsidiary subjects of instruction were music and sacred poetry, both of which had been connected with prophecy from the time of Moses (Ex. xv. 20) and the Judges (Judg. iv. 4; v. 1; cf. I. Kings x. 5; IV. Kings iii. 15; I. Par.

xxv. 16; Jon. ii. 2; Is. xii. 1; xxvi. 1; Habac. iii. 2). It was also probably the duty of the prophetic students to compose verses for the Temple music. Having been trained and taught, the prophets, whether still residing in the college or having left its precincts, had the task of teaching others. Monthly and weekly religious meetings appear to have been held by the prophets (IV. Kings iv. 23; Ezech. viii. 1; xiv. 1; xx. 1; IV. Kings vi. 32). It was probably at these meetings that many of the warnings and exhortations on morality and a spiritual religion were addressed by the prophets to their countrymen. The general appearance and life of the prophets seem to have been similar to those of the Eastern dervish of the present day. Their dress was a hairy garment, girt with a leathern girdle (Is. xx. 2; Zach. xiii. 4; Matt. iii. 4). They were married or unmarried as they chose; but their manner of life and diet were stern and austere (IV. Kings iv. 10, 38; III. Kings xix. 6; Matt. iii. 4; cf. Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, vol. ii. pp. 930 f.).

**3. THE PROPHETIC OFFICE WAS AN ORDINARY INSTITUTION.**—*a.* **The priests are not the Ordinary Teachers.**—Thus far we have shown that the prophetic office was an extraordinary one, whether we consider the divine call to that dignity or its exercise. But considered from another point of view, the prophetic office was an ordinary one. It is often stated that in the Old Testament the teaching-office was intrusted to the order of priests or to the high-priest (Becanus, *Anal. V. et N. T.*, XII. vi. q. 2; Al. Vincenzi, *De Hebræorum et Christianorum sacra monarchia*, p. 3 ff.). But the arguments on which this contention rests are not at all solid enough to bear up the superstructure. The texts usually advanced as proofs either refer to the judicial power (Dent. xvii. 8 ff.; II. Par. xix. 10) of the priests and Levites, or they concern the prophetic privilege of the Urim and Thummim (Ugolini, *Thesaurus Antiqu.*, xii. p. 375-784). The Rabbis, who are surely not accustomed to lessen their national privileges, maintain that only the king

or the president of the Sanhedrin, or another person constituted in the highest office of the commonwealth, could use the Urim and Thummim in case there was question of a public affair. According to the Scriptures, only princes of the nation, such as Josue, Samuel, Saul, David, had recourse to this method of consulting the divine will, and that only in matters of the highest importance (Jos. vii. 16 ff.; I. Kings x. 20 ff.; xiv. 18; xxii. 10; xxiii. 9; xxviii. 6). Besides all this, the Jews themselves did not attribute the teaching-ministry to the priesthood, but to the prophets (cf. I. Mac. iv. 46; xiv. 41). Jesus exhorts his audience to obey the precepts, not of the priests, but of the scribes and the Pharisees, of whom he says that they sit in the chair of Moses, not of Aaron (Matt. xxiii. 2 ff.). And how could the priests and Levites fulfil the office of instructing the nation, since they themselves were often given to idolatry and immoral practices? (II. Par. xxxvi. 15.) It must also be kept in mind that before the deposit of faith was officially completed, none but an inspired judge could decide finally whether any given doctrine, not opposed to previously revealed truth, was really revealed or the mere result of human thought.

**b. Deut. xviii. 9-22.**—The reasons, then, for ascribing the ordinary teaching-office to the priesthood of the Old Testament are rather apparent than real arguments, and several considerations have led us to doubt such a joint ministry. But there are other Scripture passages in which the ordinary teaching-office is actually ascribed to the prophets. We read in Deuteronomy (xviii. 9-22): "When thou art come into the land which the Lord thy God shall give thee, beware lest thou have a mind to imitate the abominations of those nations; neither let there be found among you any one that shall expiate his son or daughter, making them to pass through the fire: or that consulteth soothsayers, or observeth dreams and omens; neither let there be any wizard, nor charmer, nor any one that consulteth pythonic spirits or fortune-tellers, or that seeketh the

truth from the dead; for the Lord abhorreth all these things, and for these abominations he will destroy them at thy coming; thou shalt be perfect and without spot before the Lord thy God. These nations whose land thou shalt possess hearken to soothsayers and diviners; but thou art otherwise instructed by the Lord thy God. The Lord thy God will raise up to thee a prophet of thy nation and of thy brethren like unto me: him thou shalt hear, as thou desiredst of the Lord thy God in Horeb, when the assembly was gathered together, and saidst: Let me not hear any more the voice of the Lord my God, neither let me see any more this exceeding great fire, lest I die. And the Lord said to me: They have spoken all things well. I will raise them up a prophet out of the midst of their brethren like to thee: and I will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak all that I shall command him; and he that will not hear his words, which he shall speak in my name, I will be the revenger. But the prophet who being corrupted with pride shall speak in my name things that I did not command him to say, or in the name of strange gods, shall be slain. And if in silent thought thou answer: How shall I know the word that the Lord hath not spoken? thou shalt have this sign: Whatsoever that same prophet foretelleth in the name of the Lord, and it cometh not to pass, that thing the Lord hath not spoken, but the prophet hath forged it by the pride of his mind: and therefore thou shalt not fear him."

α. REASONS FOR APPLYING THE TEXT TO CHRIST ALONE.—Many interpreters apply this passage to the Messias alone. The reasons for this view are the following: 1. In the whole text there is question of "the prophet" in the singular number. 2. The prophet spoken of is to be like Moses. But, on the other hand, the singular number has in Hebrew often a collective meaning; the sacred writer speaks in Deuteronomy (xvii. 14–20) of the king in the singular number, though he evidently applies his principles to all Israelite kings. The predicted similitude be-



tween the prophet and Moses does not mean equality or identity. If this argument be urged too far, it will prove that "the prophet" cannot apply to Christ. For if the prophets were not like Moses, because they were his inferiors, Christ was not like Moses because he was infinitely his superior. It appears then that we cannot hold the position of St. Athanasius (c. Arian. Or. 1, 54. M. 26, 126), St. Isidore Pelusiota (ep. iii. 94. M. 98, 797), St. Gregory of Nyssa (Test. c. Jud. 2. M. 46, 204), Cajetan, Joseph a Costa, Estius, Patrizi, Bade, Corluy, and others who make the above text an exclusively Messianic prophecy.

*β. ITS TYPICAL REFERENCE TO CHRIST.*—Clement of Alexandria (*Pædagog.* i. 7. M. 8, 322), Venerable Bede (*In h. loc.* M. 91, 387), and St. Augustine (c. Faust. xvi. 19. 20. M. 42, 327), understand the passage as applying to Josue in its literal and to Christ in its typical sense. The same twofold reference to Christ and Josue is held by Vatable and Emmanuel Sa. In the Middle Ages, the interlineary Gloss and Burgensis applied the first part of the passage to the prophets in general (verse 15), but the latter part to Christ alone (verse 18). Eusebius of Cæsarea in three passages of his writings explicitly excludes a reference of the passage to the prophets (*Demonstrat. Evan.* iii. 2; ix. 11; *Eclog. Proph.* i. 15; M. 22, 168; 689 ff., 1072); and in another passage the same writer clearly explains this prophecy as applying to the prophets (*Eclog. Proph.* iv. M. 22, 1192). But the great bulk of writers understand the Mosaic prediction as applying to the whole series of prophets, including Christ as their head and highest fulfilment. For this opinion we may appeal to St. Jerome (*In Is.* viii. 19. M. 24, 125), Origen (c. Cels. i. 36. M. 11, 429), Theodoret (*In Jer.* vi. 16. M. 81, 545), Rhabanus Maurus (cf. *in h. l.* M. 108, 906), Walafr. Strab. (*Glossa ordin.* *in h. l.* M. 113, 471), St. Bruno Ast. (M. 164, 512), B. Albertus Magn. (*In Agg.* ii. 5), Card. Hugo, Nic. Lyranus, Dion. the Carth., Alphons Tostatus, Bonfrerius, a Lapide, Menochius, Tirinus, Fras-



sen, Gordon, Calmet, Allioli (In Jer. xxviii. 6), Reinke (Beiträge, vi. pp. 297 ff.), Loch and Reischl (In h. l.), Meignan (Les prophéties messian., pp. 611 ff.), Bisping (In Actus iii. 21), A. Scholz (Einleitung iii. p. 240), Knabenbauer (Der Prophet Isaias, p. 3 ff.), de Hummelauer (In I. Kings x. 5. Comm. p. 114), and others of less authority. We said that most authors gave this interpretation of Moses' words; for the explanation of some modern Jews and Judaizers that the prediction refers to the line of prophets only, and in no way to the Messiah, cannot claim any probability (cf. Baldensperger, pp. 138 ff.). Not to mention that it is taken as a Messianic prophecy in Acts iii. 22, 23; vii. 37, and indirectly also in Jo. i. 45; vi. 45 f.; iv. 25, we must draw attention to the array of Fathers whose names are given in the foregoing lists of Messianic interpretations. To them may be added the testimony of many more Fathers who certainly explain the passage in question as referring to the Messiah, though they do not distinctly state whether they limit it to the Messiah alone or extend it to other prophets, whether they take it in a literal or a typical sense as Messianic. Among these Fathers are: Tertullian (c. Marc. iv. 22. M. 2, 414), St. Cyprian (Test. adv. Jnd., i. 18. M. 4, 688), Lactantius (Instit. div. iv. 17. M. 6, 500), St. Philastr. (Hær. 116. M. 12, 1242), St. Gaudentius (Serm. ix. M. 20, 909), St. Cyril of Jerusalem (Cat. xii. 17. M. 33, 744), St. Epiphanius (Hær. xlii. 11; Schol. xxvii. ex. ev. Luc.; Schol. viii. ex. ep. ad Gal. M. 41, 744, 777), St. Chrysostom (In Anom. hom. xii. 1; in II. Cor. hom. vii. 3. M. 48, 803; lxi. 446), St. Cyril of Alexandria (De adoratione in spiritu et verit., ii. M. 68, 213, 253).

All we have to show, in order to establish our thesis concerning the divinely appointed connection between the ordinary office of teaching in the Old Testament and the prophetic office, is the truth that Moses' prophecy refers to the whole series of prophets and not only to their common head and fulfilment. Now this is easily shown from the position of the prophecy in Deuteronomy, from its con-

text, and from other information we have about the prophetic office and duty.

γ. ITS LITERAL REFERENCE TO THE PROPHETS.—1. The Mosaic prophecy cannot apply to the Messiah alone on account of its position in the Book of Deuteronomy. After reminding the people in the second Deuteronomic treatise of its duties towards God (Dent. xii. 1.—xvi. 17), the writer naturally passes on to the duties towards those who take God's place in regard to the people (xvi. 18—xviii. 22), and then considers its duties towards its neighbor (xix. 1—xxii. 30). Among those who take God's place Moses treats first of the civil authorities, the judges (xvi. 18—xvii. 13) and the kings (xvii. 14—20); then he considers the religious authorities, the Levites and the priests (xviii. 1—8), and the prophets (xviii. 9—22). Those authors who restrict the Mosaic prophecy to the Messiah alone destroy this clear and beautiful arrangement of Deuteronomy.

2. The Mosaic prophecy cannot refer to the Messiah alone on account of its context in Deuteronomy. The reason why God so much insists on avoiding all the abominations of the nations is the fact that he will raise up a prophet out of the people's brethren, whom any one may consult whenever occasion offers to do so. And how can this promise be said to be fulfilled, if the prophet was no one but the Messiah? Surely, the people could not have recourse to him in their daily needs for all the centuries that passed between the time of Moses and the coming of Christ. Again, God promises to give in the prophet what the people had asked for on Mount Sinai. Now the people had not asked for the Messiah, but for some one to interpret for them the will of their divine master, i.e., for a prophet. The same may be seen from the opposition between the true and the false prophets. Had the criterion of the true prophet applied to the Messiah alone, the first prophet whose predictions happened to be verified might have claimed the right of the Messiahship (cf. Jer. xxviii. 7—9; III. Kings xxii. 28).

3. All we know of the duties and the rights of the prophets agrees perfectly with the opinion that the prophets were divinely constituted as the ordinary teachers of Israel. God himself elects them (Jer. vi. 17; xxix. 15; i. 7; vii. 25; xxv. 4; Is. vi. 8; Am. ii. 11; vii. 15); they are the officially recognized persons to be consulted in the daily difficulties of life, and they are real lawgivers (Matt. v. 17; vii. 12; xxii. 40; I. Kings x. 25); God himself puts his words into their mouth (Is. li. 16; lix. 21; i. 10; xxviii. 14; xxxix. 5; lii. 6; xvi. 13; xxxvii. 22; xlii. 19; Jer. i. 9; v. 14; ii. 4, 31; vii. 2; xix. 2; xxvi. 2; Ezech. xvii. 21; xxi. 22), in such a manner that all are bound to obey the prophet under pain of the greatest punishments (III. Kings xx. 35; IV. Kings xvii. 13; II. Par. xxxvi. 15 f.; Am. vii. 16 f.).

**c. The Prophets were the Ordinary Teachers.**—Hence the prophets were the ordinary preachers of morals and of religion, the ordinary expounders of the Mosaic law both ritual and ethical, and consequently they may be said to have held the pastoral office in Israel. No doubt they had God's special assistance in the performance of their arduous duties, and when the occasion required it God enlightened their understanding in regard to the future fate of their nation and the character of their coming redeemer. And since the prophetic gift is not a "charisma gratum faciens," but a "charisma gratis datum"—in other words, since their prophetic gift was vouchsafed to the prophets for the benefit of others, God moved also their will efficaciously that they might communicate, either in writing or by word of mouth, the light which they had received. In prophecy we have, therefore, all the elements required to constitute inspiration strictly so called, and besides we find there divine revelation in the strict acceptation of the word.

*Exception Answered.*—It may be asked, How could God permit the prophets to become extinct, if he had ordained them as the ordinary teaching officials of the Jewish

nation? There are several answers to the difficulty: *a.* The Jews after returning from the Babylonian exile were less prone to idolatry than they had been in the earlier period of their history. For though we find them at times negligent in their religious duties, we never again see them given to the worship of false gods. *b.* The revealed doctrine needed to prepare the chosen people for the future teaching of Christ was completed at the time of the Babylonian exile, so that no new inspired teachers were required to pronounce on the truth of any newly-taught doctrine. The scribes, who took their rise after the return of the nation from Babylon, were fully sufficient to guard whatever had been revealed together with its traditional commentaries (cf. Joseph, c. App. i. 8; 1. Mach. iv. 46; ix. 27; xiv. 41; Eccli. xxxvi. 17 Greek text).

Hence we need not on this account abandon our thesis that the prophets were the ordinary teachers of the Israelites in matters of faith and morals; nor need we say that after the exile the prophets were silent for fear of the Gentiles (Hengstenberg), nor that then they did not feel the need of redemption (Grimm, Öhler), nor that historical and didactic literature absorbed all the Jewish activity (Schürer), nor that the Law was felt to be a sufficient revelation (Holtzmann), nor that the intellectual faculty of the people had been developed too greatly to admit of prophecies (Winer, Realwörterb. ii. p. 283; cf. Cornely, *Introd.* II. ii. pp. 282 ff.; Baldensperger, "Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu," pp. 69 ff.; Schürer, "The Jewish People," II. ii. pp. 129 ff.).

*d. Prophetic Influence in the State.*—As a natural consequence it follows that the prophets were a political power in the state. Strong in the safeguard of their religious character, they were able to serve as a counterpoise to the royal authority when wielded even by an Achab. But their political importance extended farther still; they were the preachers of patriotism—a patriotism founded on religious motives. To the subject of the theocracy the enemy of

the nation was the enemy of God, the traitor to the commonwealth was a traitor to Jehovah; the political enemy was a representative of moral evil, while the political capital, Jerusalem, was the centre of the kingdom of God—"the city of our God, the mountain of holiness; beautiful for situation, the joy of the whole earth, the city of the great king."

**e. Secondary Functions of the Prophets.**—Besides all this the prophets were the national annalists and historians. A great portion of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Jonas, and of Aggeus is directly or indirectly history. And finally, to complete the political importance of the prophets, they served as the nation's poets. It has already been mentioned that music and poetry, chants and hymns, were a main part of the studies of the class from which, generally speaking, the prophets were chosen. Hence, not only the songs of the prophetic writings, but even their narrative and instructive parts, are poetical or breathe the spirit of poetry. It may be safely stated that had the prophets' directions and counsels on political matters been heeded, had not the kings sought their selfish ends instead of the national welfare, and had the people paid less attention to the false prophets, the fate of the Hebrew commonwealth would have been far different from what it really proved to be.

**4. PROPHETS AND PRIESTS.**—It may throw more light on the nature of the prophetic office if we compare it with some of the other divinely appointed dignities of the Jewish community. And first of all, it must be well remembered that the prophetic calling differed essentially from the priestly rank. The latter consisted in learning the Law and applying it to the ritual and the legal questions (Mal. ii. 7; Lev. x. 11; Deut. xxxiii. 9, 10; xxiv. 8; Agg. ii. 11; Ezech. xlv. 23, 24). We may even suppose that the written law and the oral traditions were perpetuated by means of the priesthood (Deut. xvii. 9; cf. xxxi. 6). If we, therefore, find that several priests, such as Jeremiah,

Ezechiel, Zacharias, and even Levites, such as Hanan and perhaps Habacuc, appear as prophets, we may rightly infer that the priestly and the Levitical state were a fit preparation for the divine call to the prophetic office, though both were essentially distinct functions. Preaching as such had no representative part in the temple-service, during which only a few passages of Scripture were read as a ceremonial accompaniment. It is only after the Babylonian exile that preaching and reading were introduced into the synagogue-service as a regular part of the divine worship. The priests as such were to offer sacrifices, the prophets as such had to preach and to teach the Jewish people.

**a. They are Distinct.**—It is true that while the priests attend to the letter of the Law and its application to the sacrificial service, the prophets attend more to its spirit, and infuse its moral precepts into the daily life of the people. They generally insist on obedience to the will of God as revealed in the Law, and their exhortations dwell less on the external precepts of the Law than on its substance (cf. Robertson Smith, "The Old Testament in the Jewish Church," New York, 1890, pp. 285 ff.). They speak loudly against the dead works not vivified by the spirit, they pour out bitter sarcasm against fasts and ceremonies (Os. vi. 6; Jer. vii. 21-23; Joel ii. 13; Is. lviii.). It has been well said that the prophets were the conscience of the Jewish state. For as in man conscience applies the law written in the human heart to single actions, so did the prophets apply the Law kept by the priests to the individual acts of the Israelite.

**b. Not Opposed to Each Other.**—But it does not follow from all this that there was an opposition between the priesthood and the prophetic order. When Osee (iv. 4) wishes to draw a vivid picture of the people's depravity, he says: "But yet let not any man judge: and let not a man be rebuked: for thy people are as they that contradict the priest." "Such is the spirit," says Monsieur Lehir (p. 552), "which lives in all the prophets. If in their invective



tives against vice they at times name the priests together with the people, it is the great respect for that exalted dignity that inspires them. The more venerable the office is, the more culpable are in the prophets' eyes those who profane it by their dissolute manners. If, again, they predict a new priesthood, a holier and more spiritual religion than was that of the synagogue, we in our days speak in the same way when we treat of our heavenly home. The prophets well knew that God brings his work to its ultimate perfection by a continuous process of development, and that a more perfect state must follow the preceding less perfect."

**5. PROPHETS AND KINGS.**—There have been attempts to make Jesus Christ a thorough republican, opposed to all the pretensions, just or unjust, of monarchy. In the same way have the Jewish prophets been represented as opposed to the principle of Hebrew monarchy. Perhaps it may be well to let Reuss (*Les Prophètes*, pp. 37, 38) explain the state of the question: "Many have believed, or still believe, that the prophets were democrats in the strict sense of the word, i.e., were on principle opposed to royalty. They contrast the monarchy as instituted by men with the theocracy, as if the two were incompatible. They arm themselves with a text about Samuel (*I. Kings viii.*), wholly misunderstood, and with a stray passage from the books of Kings, in which one or another prince is the object of blame uttered precisely from a religious point of view; finally, they appeal to certain encounters between such a prophet and such a representative of the civil authority. It is hard to understand how this prejudice can continue in spite of all the facts that contradict it. We find, it is true, among the Israelites local or municipal democratic institutions; but they have existed before and independently of the prophets, and the whole Jewish nation as such has never formed a republic, unless that name be given to a state of things in which there is no government at all. The East has never, as a general rule, known any form of

a regular government except the monarchy—an autocratic and despotic monarchy. No prophet, whether of those whose deeds are recorded in authentic writings or of any other class, has ever preached the upsetting of the throne in the interest of an entirely new constitution. On the contrary, the prophets have been the first writers, if we may apply that expression to the prophets, who have conceived and proclaimed the principle of governmental legitimacy; and if, in either of the two kingdoms formed after the breaking up of David's monarchy a prophet has in consequence of the perpetual revolutions embraced the side of one pretender against another, or that of the usurper against the legitimate heir to the crown, this way of acting had other causes, and was in no way a profession of democracy (IV. Kings ix.). If one is bent on giving this name to the courage with which they pleaded the cause of the poor, the oppressed, the victims of misdirected justice, against an aristocracy of monopolists and usurers, we shall not quarrel about the expression though it is not correct. Nor is the name applied more fittingly to the good sense with which the prophets inveigh against the deplorable policy of exhausting the last resources of the land in order to make warlike preparations, ridiculously insufficient, against the forces of the neighboring powers between which the Israelites were inclosed. The prophets were politicians, not intent on recommending one form of government rather than another, but on reforming the spirit of the government in general; on giving new force to the principles of right, justice, prudence, social morality—principles which were sanctioned by the religious idea that had come from God himself,—and on opposing all that might lead the nation to its ruin" (cf. W. R. Smith, "The O. T. in the Jewish Church," pp. 349 f.).

**6. THE PROPHETS AND THE PENTATEUCH.**—After considering the relation of the prophets to the priesthood and to the kings, we must add a word about their relation to the Pentateuchal law. According to the latest view of the

critical school, the representatives of which are Wellhausen, Reuss, Maurice Vernes, Robertson Smith, Graf, and others, the traditionary view of the relation between the prophets and the Pentateuch must be inverted. Edersheim (*Prophecy and History in Relation to the Messiah*, New York 1885, pp. x. f.) states the question thus: "Whether the state of religious belief in Israel was as we had hitherto imagined, or quite different; whether, indeed, there were any Mosaic institutions at all, or else the greater part of what we call such, if not the whole, dated from much later times—the central and most important portion of them from the Exile; whether, in short, our views on all these points have to be completely changed, so that instead of the Law and the Prophets we should have to speak of the Prophets and the Law; and instead of Moses and the Prophets, of the Prophets and the Priests; and the larger part of the Old Testament literature should be ascribed to Exilian and post-Exilian times, or bears the impress of their falsifications—these are some of the questions which now engage theological thinkers, and which on the negative side are advocated by critics of such learning and skill as to have secured, not only on the Continent, but even among ourselves, a large number of zealous adherents."

**a. Importance of this Question.**—Such an inverted relation between the Pentateuch and the Prophets carries along with it the most important consequences. The ancient religion of Israel was nothing but a form of natural religion, as barbarous and cruel as the religious systems of the heathen nations living around Israel. The question about human sacrifices, about the Baal-worship, and about all kindred subjects, must in this case be rediscussed. The prophets are so many self-appointed, religious enthusiasts, and what are called fulfilled prophecies are simply a mistake. "Even without their aid," says Professor Kuenen (*Prophets and Prophecy in Israel*, pp. 589 f.), "polytheism would perhaps have made way for the recognition and the worship of one only God." Still, the professor thinks

it doubtful whether the monotheism of the people, not of the philosophers, would in that case have been ethical. Israel is therefore indebted for its dogmatic tenets concerning God and man's relation to God, and for its moral principles, to the activity and the enthusiasm of the prophets, while it owes its ritual constitution and its ceremonial code to the influence of the priests. The prophets made Israel worship Jehovah and observe the moral law; the priests, presupposing the prophetic work, added all the regulations which determined the mode of worship.

**b. Smith's View.**—Robertson Smith (*The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, New York, 1890, pp. 305 f.) expresses his views in this way: "The Hebrews before the Exile knew a twofold Torah, the Torah of the priests and that of the prophets. Neither Torah corresponds with the present Pentateuch. The prophets altogether deny to the law of sacrifice the character of positive revelation; their attitude to questions of ritual is the negative attitude of the ten commandments, content to forbid what is inconsistent with the true nature of Jehovah, and for the rest to leave matters to their own course. The priests, on the contrary, have a ritual and legal Torah which has a recognized place in the state; but neither in the old priestly family of Eli nor in the Jerusalem priesthood of the sons of Zadok did the rules and the practice of the priests correspond with the finished system of the Pentateuch. . . . The Levitical ordinances, whether they existed before the Exile or not, were not yet God's word to Israel at that time. For God's word is the expression of his practical will. And the history and the prophets alike make it clear that God's will for Israel's salvation took quite another course."

**c. Influence on the Historical Books.**—It hardly needs to be stated that according to this hypothesis the historical books too must be arranged and explained in a way different from the traditional view. To give a full explanation of the critical analysis applied to them by the critics would be out of the scope of the present Introduction to the Mes-

sianic Prophecies. Still the mention of the critical analysis cannot be entirely omitted, since many of the interpretations given by the critics are based on their view of the historical books. "The historical books of the Old Testament," says Professor Driver (Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, New York, 1892, pp. 2 ff.), "form two series: one consisting of the books from Genesis to II. Kings, embracing the period from the creation to the release of Jehoiachin from his imprisonment in Babylon, B.C. 562; the other comprising the books of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, beginning with Adam and ending with the second visit of Nehemiah to Jerusalem in B.C. 432. Though differing from each other materially in scope and manner of treatment, these two series are nevertheless both constructed upon a similar plan: no entire book in either series consists of a single original work; but older writings or sources have been combined by a compiler in such a manner that the points of juncture are often plainly discernible, and the sources are in consequence capable of being separated from one another. The authors of the Hebrew historical books—except the shortest, as Ruth and Esther—do not, as a modern historian would do, rewrite the matter in their own language; they excerpt from the sources at their disposal such passages as are suitable to their purpose, and incorporate them in their work, sometimes adding matter of their own, but often (as it seems) introducing only such modifications of form as are necessary for the purpose of fitting them together, or accommodating them to their plan." And later on (pp. 6 ff.) the author applies his general principles to the book of Genesis in particular: "As soon as the book is studied with sufficient attention, phenomena disclose themselves which show incontrovertibly that it is composed of distinct documents or sources, which have been welded together by a later compiler or redactor into a continuous whole. These phenomena are very numerous, but they may be reduced in the main to the two following heads: (1) The same event is doubly recorded; (2) The

language, and frequently the representation as well, varies in different sections. . . . The sections homogeneous in style and character with [Gen.] 1. 1-II. 4 *a* recur at intervals, not in Genesis only, but in the following books to Josue inclusive; and when disengaged from the rest of the narrative, and read consecutively, are found to constitute a nearly complete whole, containing a systematic account of the *origines* of Israel, treating with particular minuteness the various ceremonial institutions of the ancient Hebrews, and displaying a consistent regard for chronological and other statistical data, which entitles it to be considered as the framework of our present Hexateuch. This source or document has received different names suggested by one or other of the various characteristics attaching to it. . . . More recently by Wellhausen, Kuenen, and Delitzsch it has been called the Priests' Code. This last designation is in strictness applicable only to the ceremonial sections in Exodus-Numbers; these, however, form such a large and characteristic portion of the work that the title may not unsuitably be extended so as to embrace the whole; and it may be represented conveniently, for the sake of brevity, by the letter P<sup>2</sup>. . . . The parts of Genesis which remain after the separation of P have next to be considered. These also, as it seems, are not homogeneous in structure. Especially from c. 20 onwards the narrative exhibits marks of composition; and the component parts, though not differing from one another in diction and style so widely as either differs from P, and being so welded together that the lines of demarcation between them frequently cannot be fixed with certainty, appear nevertheless to be plainly discernible. Thus in 20, 1-17, our attention is arrested by the use of the term God (Elohim), while in c. 18, 19 (except 19, 29), and in the similar narrative 12: 10-20, the term Jehovah is uniformly employed. For such a variation in similar and consecutive chapters no plausible explanation can be assigned except diversity of authorship. At the same time the fact that Elohim is not here accompanied by the other



criteria of P's style forbids our assigning the sections thus characterized to that source. It seems thus that the parts of Genesis which remain after the separation of P are formed by the combination of two narratives, originally independent, though covering largely the same ground, which have been united by a subsequent editor, who also contributed inconsiderable additions of his own into a single, continuous narrative. One of these sources, from its use of the name Jahweh, is now generally denoted by the letter J; the other, in which the name Elohim is preferred, is denoted similarly by E; and the work formed by the combination of the two is referred to by the double letters J E."

*d. Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers.*—Traces of the same sources are found in the books Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, with the exception of Lev. xvii.–xxvi., which seems to spring from a different origin, and has been denoted by the letter H on account of its special laws of holiness. As to Deuteronomy, its structure is relatively simple, and bears the marks of being the work of a single author, who has taken as the basis of his discourses partly the narrative and laws of JE as they exist in the previous books of the Pentateuch, partly laws derived from other sources, and who also towards the end of his work has incorporated extracts from JE, recording incidents connected with the death of Moses. One of the final *redactors* of the Pentateuch has likewise towards the end of the book introduced notices of P relating to the same occasion. Finally, the book of Josue is said to be a continuation of the documents used in the formation of the Pentateuch. In c. i.–xii. the sources JE are mainly used, while in the subsequent chapters xiii.–xxiv. the work of P predominates, being expanded by a Deuteronomic editor, who may be called D<sup>2</sup>.

*e. Chronological Order of Sources.*—If it be asked what is the chronological order and the relative position of the various sources, it must be confessed that not all the critics are at one on these points. The more commonly received

opinion concerning the age is the following: J is placed between 850 and 800 B.C., E about 750 B.C., D between 695 and 621 B.C., JED about 600 B.C.; the Priests' Code follows the time of Ezechiel, who began the writing of the ceremonial law in c. xl.-xlviii.; P<sup>1</sup> or II (Lev. xvii.-xxvi.) was formed after Ezechiel's manner, and the historical portion seems to have been added to II according to the narrative of JE, but according to the conception of Esdras (444 B.C.). The last *redactor* compiled out of all these documents what may be called the Magna Charta of Israel, between the years 444 and 280 B.C. Hence the Hexateuch, according to this view, may be represented :

$$\frac{J + E + D + P^1 + P^2 + P^3}{\frac{R_{je}}{R_d} \quad R}.$$

**f. The Hexateuch a Development of Prophetic Doctrine.**—Ezechiel's influence on the Priests' Code has already been mentioned. Still, in view of the principles which predominate in it, and in contradistinction to the Priests' Code, JE is said to constitute the prophetic narrative of the Hexateuch. Deuteronomy is styled a prophetic reformulation and adaptation to new needs of an older legislation. It appears, therefore, that, far from giving a legal standing to the prophets, the Hexateuch is nothing but a development of the prophetic teaching [cf. H. Hupfeld, *Die Quellen der Genesis*, 1853; H. Ewald, *History of Israel* (3d ed. 1864 ff.; transl. Longmans, 1869 ff.); K. H. Graf, *Die geschichtlichen Bücher des A. T.*, 1866; Nöldeke, *Die alttestamentliche Literatur*, 1868; *Untersuchungen zur Kritik des A. T.*, 1869; J. Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs in the Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, XXI. (1876) pp. 392-450; 531-602; XXII. pp. 407-479; *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des A. T.*, 1889; *Geschichte Israel's*, I. 1878, reprinted as *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israel's*, 1883 ff., and translated as *History of Israel* (A. and C. Black, 1885);

Ed. Reuss, *La Bible* (transl. with notes and Introductions), vol. i. pp. 1-271; F. Delitzsch, 12 *Pent. kritische Studien* in the *Zeitschrift für kirchliche Wissenschaft und kirchl. Leben*, 1880; *Urmosäisches im Pent.*, *ibid.* 1882, pp. 113 ff., pp. 226 ff., p. 281 ff., pp. 337 ff., p. 449 ff., pp. 561 ff., also 1888, pp. 119 ff.; A. Kuenen, *Bijdragen tot de critick van Pent. en Josua* in the *Theol. Tijdschrift*, xi.-xviii.; W. R. Smith, *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, 1881, especially lectures viii.-xii.; W. H. Green, *Moses and the Prophets*, New York, 1883; *The Hebrew Feasts in their Relation to Recent Critical Hypotheses concerning the Pentateuch*, London, 1886; David Castelli, *La Legge del Popolo Ebreo*, 1884; R. Kittel, *Geschichte der Hebräer*, i. 1888; Prof. W. R. Harper, *Hebraica*, Oct. 1888, pp. 18-73.; July, 1889, pp. 243-291; Oct. 1889, pp. 1-48, etc.; Prof. Green, *Hebraica*, Jan.-April, 1889, pp. 137 ff.; Jan.-March, 1890, pp. 109, ff.; April, 1890, pp. 161 ff.; Delitzsch, *Comm. on Genesis*, pp. 1-38; A. Dillmann, *Die Genesis*, 3d ed. 1886; *Ex. und Lev.*, 1880; *Num., Deut. und Jos.*, 1886; Eb. Schrader's edition (the eighth) of De Wette's *Einleitung*, 1873; Ed. Reuss, *Die Geschichte der Heiligen Schriften A. T.*, 1881; A. Kuenen, *Hist. crit. Onderzoek naar het Ontstaan en de Verzameling van de Boeken des Ouden Verbonds*, 2d ed. i. i. 1885 (translated under the title *The Hexateuch*, Macmillan, 1886); E. C. Bissel, *The Pentateuch: its Origin and Structure*, 1885; Ed. Riehm, *Einleitung in das A. T.*, 1889 (published posthumously)].

**g. The Historical Hypothesis is Unsound.**—*α.* THE COMPOSITION IS IMPOSSIBLE.—Having thus far stated, as far as the present work demands it, the historical hypothesis of the recent school of criticism, we must draw the attention of the reader to a few considerations that seem to us to undermine the very foundation of our opponents' position. It evidently involves a double statement: First, the Pentateuch consists of several documents that have been welded into one; secondly, the documents thus used either are of prophetic origin or date from the time after the first

prophets had fulfilled their mission. It must be remembered that even if the first of these statements were true, it would not oppose our position regarding the relation between the prophets and the Pentateuch. For of itself it does not necessitate that we should deny to the Pentateuch its Mosaic origin. If what Wellhausen says is true regarding the composition of the Pentateuch, it is equally true that no other book was ever composed in this manner. In the composition of a work many sources may be used and many authorities quoted, yet literary history would be searched in vain for another patchwork of the kind in which half a dozen or more books are cut up and pieced together in so cunning a manner. From a purely literary standpoint, then, the story of the Pentateuch, as told by the modern critics, is not only unparalleled, but antecedently improbable (cf. Edersheim, "Prophecy and History," New York, 1885, p. 51).

*β. LANGUAGE.*—Besides all this, neither the language and style nor the subject-matter and the principles of the Pentateuch prove such a composite nature of the work. As to the language, the alleged proofs for the documentary hypothesis, as it may be called, rest principally on the varied use of the divine names and of the pronoun of the first person singular. Now both have been sufficiently explained without a recurrence to the varied authorship. Delitzsch has pointed out that the various divine names denote God from various points of view: *Elohim* is God in as far as he creates and preserves nature; *El Shadday* is God in as far as he is superior to the laws of nature, whom nature has to obey apparently against its own laws—the God of miracles; *Jahveh* is God in reference to the supernatural order—the God of revelation and of grace. Nor is the proof drawn from the various forms of the pronoun of the first person singular any more conclusive. It must be kept in mind, as Boettcher (*Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Sprache*, 1866–1868, sect. 858) has maintained, that "anokhi" and "ani" occur nearly with equal frequency in

the ancient Hebrew language, with this difference, that the longer form is used in quiet and stately style, while the shorter word stands in emphatic and lively speech. Since, therefore, the portions that are said to make up the Priests' Code contain for the most part legal enactments and other material of a kindred character, it is not at all surprising that the shorter form of the pronoun is almost exclusively used in them. But even supposing that we could not thus account for the various use of the divine names and of the various forms of the pronoun, it must be remembered that all the portions of the Pentateuch in which a similar usage of divine names and pronouns prevails pieced together will not constitute entire treatises.

γ. *STYLE OF THE DOCUMENTS.*—The argument of our opponents, which is based on the difference of style in the various documents of which the Pentateuch is said to consist, is rendered ineffective by the very position of the learned critics. In their analysis of the Pentateuch they frequently divide not only chapter from chapter, but verse from verse, and clause from clause, so that only minute fragments remain as the constituents of the different documents. Now no literary critic can pretend to judge the style of an author from scraps and bits, picked more or less at random from his work. And if at times there are any lengthier portions entirely assigned to any one author, it must be remembered that the critics first of all assign the various parts of the Pentateuch to various authors on account of the varieties of style which they find in them, and then they cry "miracle" if they find a variety of style in the various imaginary documents. Any historical work, even of the most recent date, may according to this method be divided into various documents according to the variety of style found in its narrative, descriptive, and statistic chapters.

δ. *ALLEGED REPETITIONS, CONTRADICTIONS, ETC.*—When our opponents speak of repetitions, contradictions, and parallel passages in the Pentateuch, and infer from

their existence a variety of authorship, it must be remembered that if this difficulty did exist, the proposed documentary hypothesis would not explain it. The variety of *redactors* involved in the making up of the Pentateuch, as viewed by the critics, cannot be supposed to have overlooked the above-mentioned difficulties any more than a single author can be said to have written them. And if the *redactors* were capable enough to piece together the various documents in such a masterly way as the documentary hypothesis demands, they were also able to omit or correct any contradictory statements, and to expunge bare repetitions of the same narrative. A detailed answer to the single passages advanced against us may be found in any treatise which professedly considers the Pentateuchal question (cf. Ubaldi, *Introduct.*, i. pp. 508 ff.; Cornely, *Introduct.*, part ii. vol. i. pp. 97 ff.; Lamy, *Comm. in Gen.*, pp. 15 ff.; Crelier, *La Genèse*, pp. xxi. ff.; Vigouroux, *Manuel biblique*, i. pp. 291 ff.; Flunk, *Innsbrucker Zeitschrift*, 1885, pp. 595 ff.; Knabenbauer, *Stimmen*, 1873, iv. pp. 365 ff.; Katholik, i. pp. 162 ff.; Welte, *Nachmosaisches*, pp. 82 ff.; Kaulen, *Einleitung*, pp. 167 ff.; Zschokke, *Hist. Sacra A. T.*, pp. 547 ff.; Green, *Hebraica*, 1889, pp. 137 ff.; 1890, pp. 109 ff.; 161 ff.; Hengstenberg, *Authentic des Pentateuchs*, i. pp. 181-414; ii. pp. 346-442; Keil, *Handbuch der Einleitung*, i. 2, pp. 58 ff.; *Lehrbuch der Einleitung*, 3d ed. pp. 140 ff.).

ε. HISTORICAL ARGUMENT.—If our critical opponents wish to proceed logically against us, they must base the whole weight of their argument on historical grounds, showing that historically speaking the Pentateuch cannot have antedated the time of the prophets. For we have shown already that what they say about the literary analysis of the Pentateuch and its multiple authorship may be admitted even by Catholics, provided they admit Moses as the principal and final *redactor*. Now speaking from a merely historical point of view, there are certain incontrovertible facts pointing to the Mosaic authorship of the



Pentateuch which ought to be explained satisfactorily before the post-Mosaic authorship is maintained as a thesis. The testimony of Christ and of the apostles ascribes the Pentateuch to the great Hebrew legislator, and Jewish and Christian tradition alike name Moses as the author of the Pentateuch (cf. Mark xii. 26; Luke xxiv. 44; Matt. viii. 4; Mark i. 44; Luke v. 14; Matt. xix. 8; Mark vii. 10; x. 15; Luke xx. 37; John xix. 22; v. 45-47; Acts xv. 13; II. Cor. iii. 15; Heb. ix. 19; Luke ii. 22; John i. 17; Acts xxviii. 33; Rom. ix. 15; I. Cor. ix. 9; Heb. vii. 14; Mal. ii. 22; Dan. ix. 11, 13; I. Esdr. iii. 2; vi. 18; II. Esdr. viii. 1 ff.; xiii. 1 ff.; I. Par. xvi. 40; II. Par. vii. 9; IV. Kings xvii. 23; xiv. 16; Joseph. de Bello Jud. ii. 8, 9; c. App. i. 8; Matt. xix. 7; xxii. 24; xii. 19; John viii. 5; Acts xv. 5, etc.). Besides, the Pentateuch itself bears witness that Moses wrote a book of the Law which he is said to have delivered to the keeping of the priests (Ex. xvii. 14; xxiv. 4, 7; xxxiv. 27; Num. xxxiii. 1-2; Dent. xvii. 18 ff.; xxviii. 58-61; xxix. 20, 21; xxx. 10; xxxi. 9, 14). And again, there are unmistakable traces in the Pentateuch of its having been written in the desert, by an author who was better acquainted with Egypt and its conditions than with Palestine and its geography and history (cf. Laacher, *Stimmen*, 1873, iv. pp. 212-219; Smith, *The Pentateuch*, pp. 280-375; Scholz, *Aegyptol. und die BB. Mos.*, Würzburg, 1818; Vigouroux, *La Bible et les Deconvert. mod.*, Paris, 1879, i. p. 337; ii. p. 302; Hengstenberg, *Die BB. Moses und Aegypten*, Berlin, 1841; Ebers, *Aegypten und die BB. Moses*, Leipzig; *Contemporary Review*, London, 1879, p. 758; Gesenius, *Geschichte der Heb. Sprache*, Leipzig, 1815; pp. 19 ff.; Jahn, *Beiträge ap. Bengel's Arch.*, ii. pp. 585 ff.; iii. pp. 168 ff.). The numerous passages of the Pentateuch on which this statement rests will be found in the authors indicated, and at the same time there will be found a satisfactory answer to all the difficulties raised against us by the critical school. In point of fact, all the much-vaunted historical difficulties based on the late evolution of the

feasts, the sacrifices, and the place of worship disappear as soon as the scriptural account, contained in the historical books, is read without prejudice. The numerous references and allusions to the law which we find in the prophetic writings can hardly be disposed of satisfactorily, unless we grant the prior existence of the Pentateuch: cf., e.g., Amos ii. 10 and Gen. xxv. 26; xxviii. 11; xxxii. 24; Amos iii. 1, 14 and Gen. xv. 16; Amos ii. 11, 12 and Ex. xxvii. 2; xxx. 10; Lev. iv. 7; Amos iv. 4, 5 and Numb. vi. 1-21; Amos ii. 4 and Numb. xxviii. 3, 4; Dent. xiv. 28; Lev. ii. 11; vii. 12, 13; xxii. 18-21; Dent. xii. 6; Mich. vii. 14 and Gen. iii. 14; Mich. vii. 20 and the promises made to Abraham and Jacob; Mich. vi. 4, 5 and the Exodus as happening under the leadership of Moses, Aaron, Mary, and also the fruitless attempt of Balac to have Balaam curse Israel. Similar allusions to the Pentateuchal books are found in Isaias (v. 24; xxix. 12; xxx. 9), in Osee (iv. 6; ii. 15; vi. 7; xii. 3, 4; xi. 1; viii. 1, 12), and in Jeremias (compare Jer. ii. 6 with Dent. viii. 15; Numb. xiv. 7, 8; xxxv. 33, 34; Lev. xviii. 25-28; Jer. ii. 28 with Dent. xxxii. 37; iv. 4; x. 16; xxx. 6; Jer. v. 15 with Dent. xxviii. 31, 48); in the latter prophet we find such a similarity with Deuteronomy that several critics have made him the author or at least the *redactor* of that book. In one single passage of Ezechiel, xxii. 7-12, there are no less than twenty-nine verbal citations from the books of Exodus, Leviticus, and Deuteronomy; in the 26th verse of the same xxii. chapter there are not less than four references to the Pentateuch. In chapters xvi., xviii., xx. the prophet Ezechiel rehearses God's special love for Israel and the people's obstinacy towards God according to the narrative of the Pentateuch. Not to multiply similar instances indefinitely, it seems plain from what has been said that the Pentateuch has rather inspired the prophets than that the latter have gradually developed the Pentateuch.

§. OSEE'S TESTIMONY.—As if he had foreseen the hypothesis of the critical school of to-day, the prophet

Osee seems to settle the matter under discussion beyond all the limits of any reasonable doubt. Even our opponents grant that the prophet lived before the time of King Josias, and therefore before the finding of the law in the temple, 622 B.C. Now in spite of all this, the prophet writes, viii. 12: "I shall write to him my manifold laws, which have been accounted as foreign." It is true that Reuss explains the expression "my manifold laws" as applying to the prophecies, but he must surely grant that his interpretation has no single parallel passage in the Old Testament to sustain it. Even the instances in *Isaias* (i. 10; viii. 16; viii. 20; xlii. 4, 21), in which according to some scholars the word law is said to signify prophecy, are by Schrader, as Delitzsch testifies, granted to point to an existent law. Besides all this, the expression in Osee hardly admits such a reference to prophecies. For it reads "my manifold laws," which the prophet could have hardly said of his own prophecies. And since at his time the Pharisees had not yet imposed their countless exactions on the people, an unwritten law would have been rather simple than manifold, so that at that period there must have existed a written divine law. It is inexplicable how all notice of such a written divine law should have perished; hence we must infer that the prophet Osee knew the same written law which is known to us, and which is preserved in the Pentateuch.

**7. THEOLOGY OF THE PROPHETS.—a. View of God.**—To complete our idea of the Israelite prophets we must add something about their views of God and man, i.e., about their theology and their anthropology. In general it may be said that the doctrinal element of the prophets is intermediate between the Law and the Gospel, being in advance of the former, and less complete than the latter (cf. Elliott, "Old Test. Prophecy," New York, 1889, p. 44). It positively asserts the existence of one eternal, self-conscious, intelligent, moral, and free Being, who does all things according to the purpose of his will (*Is.* xlv. 6; xlii. 6;

xlili. 10-13; xlv. 6-8; xl. 5, 18; xlviii. 12; Dan. iii. 93; v. 18, 21; Is. vi. 3; Habac. iii. 3; Is. i. 4; v. 19, 24; x. 17, 21; xii. 6; xvii. 7; xxix. 19, 23; xxx. 11, 12, 15; xli. 14; xliii. 3, 14; xlv. 11; xlvii. 4; xlviii. 17; Os. xi. 9, etc.). It ascribes to him all the attributes in infinite perfection, and is at the same time, more or less, a commentary upon the doctrine of divine providence, by ascribing the future event which it announces to a dispensation in which the Creator is present through the directive influence of his power and the counsel of his wisdom; appointing the issues of futurity as well as foreseeing them; acting with his mighty hand and outstretched arm, seen or unseen; ruling in the kingdom of men, and ordering all things in heaven and earth (Jer. x. 16; Is. xlv. 25; Dan. xiv. 4; Jer. x. 11; Is. xlv. 18; Jon. i. 9; Jer. xxxii. 17; Is. xxxvii. 16; xlv. 18 ff.; Dan. iii. 57 ff.; Is. xlv. 12; Zach. xii. 1; Mal. ii. 10; Is. xliii. 7; Jer. x. 23; xviii. 6; Dan. v. 23; Jer. x. 13; Amos iii. 6; Jer. i. 10; Is. xxxvii. 26, etc.).

**b. Divine Names.**—As to the divine names which the prophets employ, it must be observed that their ordinary appellation is Jahveh, though Elohim is not unknown in their writings (cf. Is. xlv. 10; xlv. 22; xlv. 6, 9; Os. ii. 1; Jon. iv. 2; Mal. ii. 10), and even Elah and El occur (cf. Dan. iii. 28; vi. 8, 13; xi. 36). The expression Jahveh Zebaoth, or a modification of it (Jer. v. 14; xv. 16; xxxviii. 17; xlv. 7), occurs frequently, and is usually rendered the Lord of hosts. No doubt the prophets acknowledge God's power over empires, his supreme rule over the fate of battles and the distribution of victory (Os. xiii. 9; Zach. x. 5, etc.); in a few passages they most probably understand the expression Jahveh Zebaoth in the sense of Lord of armies (Is. xliii. 4; xxxi. 4); but if we remember that the phrase "host of the heavens" frequently denotes the multitude of angels (III. Kings xxii. 19; II. Par. xviii. 18; Ps. cii. 21; cf. Jos. v. 14), or the sun, the moon, and the stars (Deut. xvii. 3; IV. Kings xvii. 16, xxi. 3 f.; Is. xxxiv. 4; xl. 26; xlv. 12; Jer. xxxii. 22; Dan. viii. 10), we

may safely infer that the expression Jahveh Zebaoth denotes rather the Lord of the heavenly hosts than of earthly armies. And far from confounding the Lord with the heavenly bodies, the prophets rather distinguish God against the gods of their idolatrous neighbors who adored the heavenly bodies as so many deities (cf. Reuss, "*Les Prophètes*," i. p. 33; Trochon, *Introduction*, pp. xlix. ff.).

c. **The "Name of the Lord."**—The prophets often employ the expression "the name of the Lord" to designate God himself. We may refer to the following passages as instances of this usage: Mal. i. 6, 11; ii. 2; iii. 16; Is. xxix. 23; lii. 51; lvi. 6; Jer. xii. 16; xxxiv. 16; Bar. ii. 32; Ezech. xx. 39; xliii. 7, 8. The "name of the Lord" in this meaning receives all the divine attributes; it is holy, sublime, great, dreadful, worthy of praise, eternally blessed, forever glorious (Is. lvii. 15; Ezech. xxxvi. 20; xxxiv. 7, 25; xliii. 7; Am. ii. 7; Is. lii. 4; Ezech. xxxvi. 23; Mal. i. 11; i. 14; Dan. iii. 52; iii. 26). Oftener still the prophets use the divine name to signify God's power in the world, his activity, the revelation by means of which he has communicated with men (Is. xxvi. 8). Again, the name of God is identified with his sanctity (Ezech. xxxix. 7; xliii. 7, 8; xxxvi. 22 ff.; xx. 14 f.; xxxix. 25; Is. lx. 9), and in other passages with his majesty, his dignity and glory, his saving power, his goodness and mercy, and the authority with which he endows his messengers (Is. lix. 19; Dan. ix. 15; Jer. xxxii. 20; Bar. ii. 11; Dan. iii. 26, 34, 43, 52; Is. xlviii. 9; Ezech. xx. 9, 14, 22; Jer. xiv. 21; xxxvi. 21; Is. lxiii. 12, 14; xii. 4; xxiv. 15; xxv. 1; Jer. xiv. 7; Ezech. xx. 44; Jer. xx. 9; xlv. 16; Dan. ix. 6; Jer. xiv. 14; xxiii. 25; xxix. 9, 21, 23).

d. **Mystery of the Holy Trinity.**—At the same time, the Trinity of persons is at least obscurely implied in the prophetic writings. Emmanuel, the child of the Virgin, is to be the Wonderful, Counsellor, mighty God, Prince of peace, Father of eternity, and the Son of God (Is. vii. 14; ix. 6, 7; xlii. 1; Mich. v. 1, 5). In other passages the

prophets speak about the spirit of the Lord, to whom they attribute intellect and will, and therefore personality. This spirit speaks to Ezechiel, resuscitates the dead bones, acts on the Cherubim, fills the prophet Micheas with strength, and is predicted to be poured out upon all flesh (Ezech. i. 4-28; ii. 2-9; xxxvii. 9-14; Mich. iii. 8; Joel ii. 28, 29). In other passages of the prophetic writings the Trinity seems to be indicated still more clearly. Thus the Lord announces that he has put his spirit upon his servant (Is. xlii. 1)—a passage necessarily implying three different persons. Again (Is. xlviii. 16) we read: "From the time before it was done, I was there, and now the Lord God hath sent me and his spirit." Jesus too applies to himself the words of Isaias (lxi. 1): "The spirit of the Lord is upon me: wherefore he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor, he hath sent me to heal the contrite of heart, to preach deliverance to the captives, and sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of reward" (Luke iv. 18, 19). Other passages distinguish the angel of the Lord, or the word of God according to a common interpretation, from the spirit of God (Is. lxiii. 7-10; Agg. ii. 5, 6; Ezech. i. 3; Zach. iv. 6, etc.). Several Fathers, such as St. Ambrose (*De Spiritu Sancto*, iii. 21; *de fide ad Grat.* 4), St. Jerome (*In Is.* vi. 3), St. Fulgentius (*de fide ad Pet.* 6), Origen (*Hom.* 4), St. Cyril, St. Procopius, St. Gregory Naz. (*De Paschate*), St. John Damasc., St. Gregory of Nyssa (*c. Eunom.* i.), St. Athanasius (*De Incarnatione*, c. Arian. n. 10), maintain that there is a vestige of the Holy Trinity in the threefold Holy of the Seraphim as recorded by the prophet Isaias (vi. 3).

**c. Prophetic Anthropomorphism.**—If it be objected that the frequent anthropomorphisms of the prophetic writings are signs of their low and imperfect idea of God, it must be remembered that they could not have spoken differently had they wished to do so. The language they used was not capable of expressing abstract and highly spiritual



ideas except by image and metaphor. Many of the metaphorical expressions of the prophetic writings are used even to-day without on that account testifying that our ideas of God are low and material. Even we speak of the arm of God, of his eyes, his anger and justice and mercy; nor can we reasonably expect the prophets to be more in advance of their time in purely scientific matters, such as the shape and form of the earth, the constitution of matter, the theory of the stars. In all these points they naturally speak as the men of their day spoke; for the spirit of God did not inspire them in order to advance the world in the sphere of science, but to instruct the human race in the knowledge of salvation (cf. Reuss, *Les Prophètes*, i. pp. 29 ff.; Zschokke, *Theologie der Propheten des alten Testaments*, Freiburg, 1877; Scholz, *Handbuch der Theologie des alten Bundes im Lichte des neuen*, Regensburg, 1862; Delitzsch, *Die biblisch-prophetische Theologie*, Leipzig, 1845; Öhler, *Theologie des alten Testaments*, Tuebingen, 1873; Haag, *Théologie biblique*, Paris, 1870; Schultz, *Alttestamentliche Theologie*, Frankfurt, 1869; Duhm, *Die Theologie der Propheten*, Bonn, 1875).

**8. ANTHROPOLOGY OF THE PROPHETS.**—*a. General Outline.*—As to the prophetic anthropology, man is created by God, has a common origin, is endowed with reason, and is capable of attaining sanctity. Though man can make progress, he cannot save himself, but is subject to the rule and law of God, to whom he owes homage and worship. The Decalogue determines man's obligation to his fellow-men. But by this alone man cannot be saved; faith and hope in God are absolutely necessary to salvation. If man has sinned he must repent in order to regain God's grace, and without penance the sinner's destruction is inevitable (Mal. ii. 10; Is. i. 18; Ezech. xii. 2; Is. ii. 3, 4, 5; Jer. ii. 22; xiii. 23; Os. xiii. 9; Is. i. 19, 20; Ezech. xviii. 4, 5, 9; xxxiii. 11-16; Dan. iv. 34, 35; Is. lx. 6, 7; Mal. i. 11; iii. 10; Habac. ii. 4; Is. xxvi. 3, 4; Is. lv. 7; Ezech. xxxvi. 31; xx. 43).

**b. Beginning and End.**—Man's beginning and end are also very minutely described by the prophets. God gives the life of man and takes it away. Life itself is extremely frail: it passes away as the flower of the field; men disappear as the flies, and they die as the smoking flax is extinguished. Death is the separation of body and soul; it is a sleep and a rest, though at the same time it is the wages of sin, and general because sin is general. Even the prophets are not exempt from sin or death. Often death is represented as the punishment of personal sin, so that it alone is able to appease the wrath of God. Though death is very bitter, it is at times better than life itself—the recompense, as it may be, of good works and true conversion. An instance of God's preserving the life of his faithful servants we find in the three youths thrown into the fiery furnace. Personifications of death also occur in the prophetic writings: it has hands, penetrates into the house by any opening, sends desolation through the land, is as insatiable as are the barbarian devastators of the civilized world. Metaphorically death denotes sin, and in this manner the sinner's conversion is symbolized by the resurrection (Is. xxxix. 12, 13; xxxi. 1, 3; xl. 6; xxxvii. 27; lxiv. 5; ii. 22; li. 12; li. 6, 8; xliii. 17; Jer. xv. 9; Is. liii. 12; Lam. ii. 12; Bar. ii. 17; Is. xvii. 16; Jer. iv. 10; Jon. ii. 6; Jer. iv. 31; Jon. iv. 8; Is. xxxviii. 17; Jon. iv. 2; Jer. xviii. 18; Jer. li. 39, 57; Dan. xii. 2; Is. xiv. 8, 18; lvii. 1; Ezech. xxxi. 18; xxxii. 21, 28, 30; Nah. iii. 18; Is. vi. 5; Zach. i. 5; Is. xxii. 13, 14; xxv. 8; Jer. viii. 3; xx. 14 ff.; Ezech. xix. 5-9, 14-20; xviii. 21, 22; Dan. iii. 88; vi. 20; xiv. 21; Habac. i. 12; Dan. iii. 88; Jer. ix. 20; Os. xiii. 14; Habac. ii. 5; Ezech. xxxvii. 11-14; Bar. iii. 10, 11).

**c. Sheol.**—When man's existence on earth ceases with the death of his body, then his soul descends according to the prophetic writings down into Sheol. Whether we derive the word Sheol from "sha'al" (to ask), or from "shaal" (to dig), is of little consequence. In the one case

the meaning of the word agrees with the prophetic idea of Sheol's insatiability; in the other it gives the equally prophetic idea of Sheol's being the world below, the land of the lower world, whose inhabitants are called the inhabitants of the dust. At times the word *Bor* is used instead of *Sheol*; but it too has the meaning of ditch, abyss. The older prophets place *Sheol* in opposition to the land of the living; they consider it as a prison surrounded by walls and gates, and furnished with bolts. Often it is only another expression for death. Being essentially a subterraneous place, or a ditch into which man descends, in which he lies down, and whence he can be drawn forth, *Sheol* is often opposed to the sphere of light: it is the land of darkness, the valley of the shadow of death, the place of obscurity. It has been thought that the state of the soul in *Sheol* bears analogy to the state of the body in the grave—that, in other words, it suffers the effects of the anger and the judgment of God. Others, on the contrary, see in *Sheol* the dwelling-place of the *Rephaim*, i.e., of those that slumber, of the feeble ones, the shades, of the dead—in a word, of those who have been separated from their bodies. All praise of God is interdicted in *Sheol*, and only the most sombre silence reigns there. All earthly power and grandeur is swallowed up in *Sheol's* abyss; the kings of *Babylon* rest there in company with all those who have died before them. In the description of the destruction of *Tyre* and of *Egypt*, *Sheol* resembles an immense cemetery, a vault holding numberless dead. Whether the fate of all the dead is alike in *Sheol* is a much discussed problem: on this point as well as on the fact of the future resurrection the prophetic doctrine has been supplemented by the teaching of the Gospels. Still, even *Isaias*, *Ezekiel*, and especially *Daniel* have the idea of a resurrection of the dead. In the last-named prophet (xii. 2) we read: "And many of these that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some unto life everlasting, and others unto

reproach, to see it always" (Is. v. 14; Habac. ii. 5; Is. xiv. 15, 19; xxiv. 22; xxxviii. 18; Ezech. xxvi. 20; xxxi. 14, 16; xxxii. 18, 24, 25, 29, 30; Is. xxvi. 19; Ezech. xxvi. 20; xxxii. 18, 24; xliv. 23; Ezech. xxxi. 11, 16, 18; xxvi. 20; xxxi. 14; Is. xxxviii. 10, 11; xiv. 15; xxxviii. 18; v. 14; xiv. 19; Ezech. xxxii. 23; xxvi. 20; xxxi. 14, 15, 16; xxxii. 18, 21, 24-30; xxxii. 19; Bar. iii. 19; Is. xxxviii. 17, 18; Jer. xiii. 16; Lam. iii. 6; Is. xxiv. 22; Zach. ix. 11; Is. xxxviii. 10; Amos ix. 2; Is. v. 14; Habac. ii. 5; Is. xxxviii. 17; xiv. 9, 10; xxvi. 14, 19; Bar. ii. 17; Is. xxxviii. 18, 19; xiv. 10, 11; lxiii. 16; Ezech. xxvi. 20; xxxi. 14-18; xxxii. 18-32; Is. xxvi. 19; Ezech. xxxvii.; Os. xiii. 14; cf. Böttcher, *De inferis, rebusque post mortem futuris ex Hebræorum et Græcorum opinionibus*, Dresd. 1846; Öhler, *Veteris Testamenti sententia de rebus post mortem futuris*, 1844; Hahn, *De spe immortalitatis sub Veteri Testamento gradatim exulta*, 1846; H. Schultz, *Veteri Testamento de hominis immortalitate sententia*, 1860; T. H. Martin, *La vie future*, 3d ed., Paris, 1870; Halévy, *Comtes rendus de l'Académie des Inscrip. et B. Lettres*, 1873, pp. 124-146; Mgr. Freppel, *Œvres polemiques*, Paris, 1874; Vigouroux, *La Bible et les Decouv. modern.*, 1st ed. ii. pp. 391-464; Rohrbacher, *Histoire de l'Église*, ed. Palme, i. pp. 543 ff.; Amelineau, *Contemporain du 1er. mars 1883*).

*Review.*—The teaching of the prophetic books is therefore, as has been stated, midway between the Law and the Gospel. It explains especially the principles of personal sanctity better than they are set forth in the Pentateuch. The prophets do not promise any merely temporal advantage or threaten any merely temporal punishment for the observance or non-observance of the law; their promises and threats regard mostly spiritual goods and the future life. It is true that the purely ceremonial precepts are not in very high esteem with the prophets; but since the law had established the supreme principle to love God with all our heart and all our soul, with our whole strength

and our whole mind, the prophets could do nothing else than throw new light on the explanation of this law without attempting to add to its extent. Thus the prophets really acknowledge the Mosaic code of laws with all its rules and prescriptions, and like him whom they predicted in word and act, they did not destroy the law, but fulfilled the same.

## CHAPTER V.

## THE WRITINGS OF THE PROPHETS.

**1. THE PROPHETIC WRITINGS ARE INSPIRED.**—The first characteristic of the prophetic writings is their inspiration. Not to adduce arguments that may be derived from the nature of prophecy, the prophets themselves insist on the fact that they were inspired by God or commanded to write down their divinely received communications. Thus Isaias (viii. 1) tells us: "And the Lord said to me: Take thee a great book, and write in it with a man's pen." Again (xxx. 8), the prophet is bidden: "Now therefore go in and write for them upon box, and note it diligently in a book, and it shall be in the latter days for a testimony for ever." Jeremias too received divine commands to write down his divinely inspired intuitions. His own testimony (xxx. 2) is unmistakable: "Thus saith the Lord, the God of Israel, saying: Write thee all the words that I have spoken to thee in a book." And a few chapters later on the divine order is still more emphatic (xxxvi. 2): "Take thee a role of a book, and thou shalt write in it all the words that I have spoken to thee against Israel and Juda, and against all the nations: from the day that I spoke to thee, from the days of Josias even to this day." Similar words are met in Habacuc (ii. 2): "And the Lord answered me and said: Write the vision and make it plain upon tables: that he that readeth it may run over it." And though we have not the explicit words of God in the case of all the particular prophetic books, testifying to their divine inspiration, our statement is nevertheless true beyond all reasonable doubt. Or did not the prophets fulfil part of their super-



natural calling by writing? But they could fulfil no part of their office without the assistance of the divine inspiration. And again, if God had not inspired the whole book of *Isaias*, e.g., how could the prophet call it the book of the Lord? (cf. *Is.* xxxiv. 16; *Ezech.* iii. 25.) It is for this very reason too that the Fathers compare the prophets to musical instruments which the Holy Ghost plays upon, or to a most faithful mirror representing its object with the greatest minuteness (*St. Athenagoras*, *Legat. pro. Christ.*, 9. M. 6, 908; *St. Justin*, *Cohort. ad gent.* 8. M. 6, 256; *St. Basil*, *In Is. prooem.* 3. M. 30, 122).

**2. SPOKEN AND MERELY WRITTEN PROPHECIES.**—It must, however, be noted that not all the single parts of the prophetic books have been written in the same manner: some were delivered orally previous to their writing; others were put in writing without having ever been spoken in public. To this second class belong all those portions in which there is no trace of an oratorical form, such as the book of *Jonas*, *Is.* xxxvi.—xxxix., *Jer.* xxxvi.—xliii., lii., *Dan.* i.—vi., all the introductory and explanatory remarks which accompany the oratorical portions, letters and all matter of a similar character, e.g., *Jer.* xxix., *Bar.* vi., *Is.* vi., *Dan.* vii. ff.; all those parts in which we have indeed the oratorical form, but whose subject-matter is entirely unfit for public delivery, such as the second part of *Isaias* xl.—lxvi., the last chapters of *Ezekiel*, xl.—xlviii., the prophecies concerning the future fate of the gentile nations: *Nah.*, *Is.* xiii. ff., *Jer.* xlvi. ff.

**3. ABBREVIATED PROPHECIES.**—Those parts of the prophetic books which repeat speeches previously delivered in public do not always adhere to the letter of the matter delivered. *Jeremias*, e.g., testifies that he received the command to write all that the Lord had spoken to him from the days of the king *Josias* even to this day (*xxxvi.* 2); still, it is quite clear that he cannot have literally committed to writing all his public instructions delivered during the space of twenty-three years. The same compendi-

ous manner of writing is proved by Knabenbauer (Comm. in Pro. Minor. i. 20) to exist in the prophet Osee. The very title of the book shows this, signifying as it does the length of time during which the events recorded by the prophet took place. Then the concise and heavy style of the book renders it almost evident that its contents cannot have been literally delivered to the people, who would not have been able to understand such concise language. It seems certain that all the Minor Prophets followed this manner of writing, expressing their previous discourses in the most concise and orderly manner. That Jeremias wrote a compendium, we have already pointed out; Isaias (ii.-v.) furnishes another instance of a Greater Prophet presenting a summary of his prophetic activity during a definite period of time.

**4. TITLES OF THE PROPHETIC BOOKS.**—It follows from what has been hitherto said that the prophetic style is more polished and ornate than is usually found in speeches delivered *ex tempore*. But from the fact that the spoken words of the prophets have undergone such an emendation of style and language, it does not follow that we must, therefore, assume the existence of one or more so-called “redactors.” On the other hand, not all the prophetic books have been composed with the same care. Jonas among the older prophets, and Ezechiel, Daniel, Aggeus, and Zacharias among the later ones, begin their books without any title, after the manner of the historians. In the case of Jonas and Daniel such a proceeding was to be expected on account of the historical character of their writings. The other three prophets omitted the title perhaps to indicate that the conditions of their times differed from those of their predecessors in the prophetic office. Isaias and Abdias call their books “Vision,” Jeremias, Osee, Joel, Micheas, and Sophonias call them “the Word of the Lord;” Amos in a manner joins the preceding two titles: “the words of Amos . . . which he saw;” Nahum, Habacuc, and Malachias express in the title of their books both their

divine origin and their characteristic subject-matter: "the burden of Ninive, the book of the vision of Nahum;" "the burden that Habacuc the prophet saw," the burden of the word of the Lord to Israel by the hand of Malachias."

**5. THE PROPHETIC STYLE.**—Since the prophets were sent to confirm by means of divinely inspired sermons and exhortations the pious in the law and to convert the sinners, thus preparing all for the new Christian dispensation, it is to be expected that they should write in an oratorical style. And the near affinity existing between the oratorical and the poetical style, as even Cicero has observed (*De orat.* 16), renders it antecedently probable that the prophetic style should be an approach to the style of the poet. The difference between the mere prose style and the prophetic style properly so called is perhaps best illustrated from the writings of the prophets themselves, i.e., by a comparison between those passages in which they write as mere historians and those others in which they address the people with exhortations, threats, or promises (cf. *Is.* xxxvi.—xxxix.; *Jer.* xxvi.; xxxvi.—xli., etc.). Poetical metaphors, allegories, parables, and even the parallelism of members may be found throughout the prophetic writings. This same peculiarity has been observed by Ribera (*Comm. in l. duodecim proph. in Nahum Præf.*), by C. Vitranga (*Comm. in Is. Prolegom. Leovardiæ, 1714, p. 8*), and has been perhaps exaggerated by Lowth (*Præl.* 18 ff.).

**6. OBSCURITY OF THE PROPHETS.**—Another and most important characteristic of the prophetic style is its obscurity. There can hardly be any reasonable doubt about the fact of the obscurity. Nearly all the patristic as well as the more recent writers who have made a special study of the prophecies have complained of their exegetic difficulties. St. Chrysostom (*Hom. de obscurit. Proph. M.* 56, 163), Theophylactus (*In Os. prooem. M.* 126, 569), St. Cyril of Alexandria (*In Is. xxvii. 13. M.* 70, 609), St. Jerome (*In Ezech. xlv. 10; in Os. xiv. 10; in Is. xxi. 3; in Jer.*

ix. 14; xxxi. 25; in Nah. ii. 1; in Jer. xxi. 1; xxv. 1; M. 25, 470; 25, 992; 24, 196; 24, 767; 24, 916; 25, 1303; 24, 839; 24, 865), Cornelius a Lapide (*In Is. Proleg.*), Calmet (*Proleg. in Proph.*), Patrizi (*De interpretatione oraculorum ad Christum pertinentium prolegomenon*, Romæ, 1853, pp. 1 ff.), Reinke (*Beiträge*, ii. pp. 33-92), Vigouroux (*Manuel biblique*, pp. 466 ff.), Zschokke (*Theologie der Propheten*, pp. 387-394), Hengstenberg (*Christologie*, 2d ed., Berlin, 1856, iii. 2, pp. 180 ff.), are some of the witnesses testifying to the obscurity of the prophetic writings. But we have still more reliable witnesses than the commentators in the prophets themselves. In the very passage describing Isaiah's prophetic mission we read (*Is. vi. 9-13*): "Go, and thou shalt say to this people: hearing hear, and understand not, and see the vision and know it not. . . ." And later on (*Is. xxix. 11*), when the prophet is describing the people's future knowledge of the prophetic writings, he says: "And the vision, of all shall be unto you as the words of a book that is sealed, which when they shall deliver to one that is learned, they shall say: Read this, and he shall answer: I cannot, for it is sealed." Jeremias tells his readers that they shall understand the counsel of God in the latter day, i.e., when the prophecies will have been fulfilled (*Jer. xxiii. 20; xxx. 24*). Ezechiel too (*xxxiii. 33*) points to the time of fulfilment as the period when the prophecies will be properly understood. "And when that which was foretold shall come to pass, for behold it is coming, then shall they know that a prophet hath been among them." The prophet Zacharias needs the explanation of an angel in order to understand the prophetic symbols which he has seen (*Zach. i. 9; ii. 2; iv. 4; v. 6*, etc.). The same angelic ministry we meet in the writings of Daniel *viii. 27* and *xii. 8* ff.; in the latter passage the angel distinctly foretells that the vision will remain closed till the time of its fulfilment.

**a. Reasons of Obscurity.**—The fact of the prophetic obscurity being established, there can be no doubt that

many of the prophecies are clearer and more intelligible to us than they were to the Jews in the Old Testament. On the other hand, as appears from the foregoing testimony of the Fathers and the commentators, many of the biblical prophecies are still a mystery for us. These may be reduced to three classes: 1. Several have not yet been fulfilled, and cannot be fully understood till the time of their fulfilment. 2. Others have been fulfilled, but are unintelligible to us, because we are ignorant of ancient history. This class of prophecies has been made much more intelligible through the recent Assyriological and Egyptological studies (cf. Vigouroux, *La Bible et les Découvertes modernes*. iv.; Brunengo, *L'impero di Babilonia e di Ninive*, Prato, 1885, ii.; Knabenbauer, *Comm. in proph. minor.*, i. pp. 138, 295, 314, 362; ii. pp. 48, 312, etc.; Schrader, *Die Keilinschriften und das A. T.*, 2d ed. pp., 382-455). 3. A third class of prophecies is obscure either on account of the sublime mysteries of which the predictions treat or by reason of the manner in which they have been proposed by the prophets. This third kind of obscurity deserves a word of explanation.

α. CONFUSION OF TENSES.—There is first of all a confusion of tenses in the prophetic writings: what is future is represented as present or even as past. The reasons for this kind of obscurity are manifold. St. Chrysostom (*c. Anom.* 7, 5; in *illud*: *Pater si possibile est.* 3. M. 48, 764), St. Augustine (*In Ps. xliii. n. 5. M. 36, 485*), and St. Jerome (*In Is. v. 25. M. 24, 91*) maintain that the prophets use the past or the present tense instead of the future in order to signify that what they predict is as certain as if it had already taken place. But St. Chrysostom (*In Gen. i. hom. 10, 4. M. 53, 85*) and St. Augustine (*In Ps. iv. n. 6. M. 36, 75*) assign another reason for the change of tenses which seems to be more satisfactory. Since the prophetic revelation was commonly received in visions, they say it is natural that the prophets should tell them as if they were now before their eyes, or as if they had been previously seen.

Hence the vivid description of the Virgin conceiving and bringing forth a son, the glad announcement that a child has been born for us, a son has been given to us, hence too the reference to Cyrus as if he were a king of the prophet's own time (cf. Is. vii. 14; ix. 6; xlv. 28 ff.; xl.-lxvi.; xxxiv. 16; Knabenbauer, "*Der Prophet Isaias*," p. 455; Reinke, *Beiträge*, p. 41).

*β.* **FRAGMENTARY CHARACTER OF PREDICTIONS.**—In the second place must be noted the fragmentary character of most of the prophetic predictions; for this too has given rise to divers misinterpretations of the Messianic prophecies. Hence it is that the Rabbinic writers have taken occasion to write about a double Messias—one covered with suffering and another celebrated for his power and glory; one the son of Joseph, the other the son of David and Juda (cf. Eisenmenger, "*Das entdeckte Judenthum*," ii. pp. 720 ff.). The modern rationalists have, on account of the fragmentary nature of the prophetic writings, seen contradictions between the Messianic hopes as held out in the different prophecies. Joel, e.g., is said to have expected only a Messianic kingdom, while Isaias expects a personal Messias. But St. Paul (I. Cor. xiii. 9) seems to have anticipated this difficulty when he says: "We know in part, and we prophesy in part." St. Chrysostom (In Ps. xlv. n. 3. M. 55, 187) sees in this precisely the difference between the Prophet and the Evangelist—that the latter tells us all, while the former gives only a partial communication. St. Thomas (II.<sup>a</sup> ii.<sup>ae</sup> q. 171, a. 4) insists on the same solution of the difficulty which springs from the fragmentary character of the prophecies: "The prophets do not know all that can be prophesied, but each one knows something of it, according to his special revelation about this or that particular point."

*γ.* **THE IDEA OF PROPHECY DOES NOT INVOLVE ABSOLUTE CLEARNESS.**—If the unintelligibility of many of the prophecies be urged against us, it must be remembered that the prophet could not predict a future event more clearly than he had been instructed to do. But absolute clearness



is not required in prophecy as such. All that is needed in order to have a true prediction is an unmistakable sign or picture of the future event in question. Now a sign or picture need not always represent the object in all its details. Thus even a rude sketch may be said to represent a person or a thing, though the thousand little minutiae which make up the person's countenance or give expression to the landscape may be wanting (cf. Jahn-Ackermann, *Introductio* in V. T. p. 221; Patrizi, *De interpretatione orac. messian. Proleg.* p. 3). The prophets often give us such a rough sketch of the future event. If they were to do otherwise, two most serious inconveniences would follow. First, human liberty would, at least apparently, be diminished. For if certain historical events, absolutely definite in their particulars, were certainly going to happen, men might be tempted to doubt their own freedom in bringing them about. Or, on the other hand, men would have striven with all their might to render vain the predictions of the prophets. What would not the hard-hearted Jews have done to prevent the passing away of the Synagogue into the hands of the Son? Herod's rage would have been nothing as compared with their endeavors to slay the Son and his Mother. The second inconvenience flowing from too great clearness of the prophetic predictions would be a lessening of their apologetic value. For in such a case it might always be objected that the fulfilment had been brought about designedly by the persons interested in seeing it established (cf. Patrizi, *De interpret. oracul. messianic. Proleg.* p. 2; Le Hir, *Études bibliques*, i. p. 82).

δ. ABSENCE OF CHRONOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE.—One of the greatest sources of prophetic obscurity is the absence of what we may call chronological perspective from many of the prophetic writings. In this respect the predictions of the prophets resemble the pictures of the ancient Egyptians and Assyrians, so notably defective in local perspective. The prophets saw the future events as we see the stars in the firmament; they may be millions of miles

distant from one another, but to us they appear as almost contiguous. This perplexing confusion in chronology becomes more distressing when the prophet passes from type to anti-type and returns again to the type without indicating in the least his transition. Thus Isaias blends into one the coming of the Messiah and the destruction of Babylon (Is. x., xi.); the redemption of the Jews from the Babylonian captivity and the redemption of man from sin (xl.-lxvi.), the complete destruction of Babylon and its first conquest by the Persians (xiii., xix.). The manner in which the type and its anti-type are at times blended into one is thus described by Le Hir (*Études bibliques*, i. pp. 81 ff.): "Very often there is only one meaning in the prophecies, but an extended one, and the division is only apparent in the particular applications one can make of it. At other times the text sets two objects made after the same pattern before our eyes, and outlines them at the same time. Imagine two palaces of unequal dimensions, but offering nearly the same arrangement of rooms, courts, corridors, etc. The smaller one is nearer to you, and so situated that if it were transparent as crystal your eye would catch with one glance the outlines and the shape of both. If, on the contrary, this transparency were veiled, unequal or intermittent, you would need several combinations to complete in your mind the picture of the larger edifice, but you could not doubt about its existence nor about its principal features. Thus it is with a prophecy having a double object. The nearer object seems at times to vanish in order to let the more important and greater event which occupies the background shine through in all its brilliancy. At other times the nearer outlines are the darker ones, and they partially conceal those behind. But our reason, following the lead of analogy, easily restores to each of the two objects what the eye discovers only confusedly" (cf. Reinke, *Beiträge*, ii. p. 42; Vigouroux, *Manuel biblique*, ii. p. 468).

€. CHRONOLOGICAL ACCURACY IS NOT ALWAYS WANT-

ING.—Still it must not be imagined that the prophetic predictions are always absolutely indistinct in point of chronology. Thus *Isaias* clearly announces that *Ephraim* will cease to be a people after sixty-five years (vii. 8), the glory of *Moab* will vanish after three years (xvi. 14); *Egypt* and *Ethiopia* too have a period of three years assigned them (xx. 3); the glory of *Cedar* will be taken away in one year (xxi. 16; cf. xxiii. 15; xxix. 1; xxxii. 10; xxxviii. 5; *Jer.* xxv. 12; xxvii. 7; xxix. 10; xxviii. 16; *Ezech.* xxiv. 1; xxix. 11; *Dan.* ix. 25 ff.; *Zschokke*, l. c., p. 390). Whoever grants God the power of foreseeing the future, need not seek for artificial ways of explaining all such definite predictions. They have not been forged after the event had taken place, nor are they later glosses added to the text; nor, again, have their numbers a merely symbolic meaning. Where we are unable to trace the exact fulfilment according to the letter of the prophecy, we must impute the defect to our ignorance of history, and not to the falsity of the prophetic prediction. In other passages the prophets give no notice at all of the time at which the event foretold will occur. Instances of this we find in *Is.* i. 24; ii. 9 ff.; iii. 16 ff., etc. Then again, the chronological determination of the prophetic predictions is vague, so that they differ little from the preceding class. Such is the case in *Is.* xvii. 4; xviii. 7; xix. 16; *Jer.* iii. 16; ii. 2; xxx. 8; *Ezech.* xxxiii. 8, etc. But even in those prophecies in which the chronological order of type and anti-type has been blended into one, the Jews could distinguish the former from the latter. As now we can to some extent distinguish in the last prophecies of *Jesus* what refers to the destruction of *Jerusalem* from what refers to the end of the world by looking at the history of the former event, so could the Jews compare the historic type with the prophecy, and thus learn which particulars of the prediction referred to the anti-type. In other instances the gap of chronology in the one prophet is filled out by clearer

determinations of another. An instance of this we see in Is. xiii. 22, as compared with Jer. xxv. 12.

ξ. PROPHETIC IMAGERY.—Since the prophets were mostly illumined by visions, the use of imagery is very frequent in their predictions. For they do not speak of the future in abstract terms, but commonly by means of the same images they themselves had seen. Now such prophetic images are either types or they are symbols. A word must be said of each in order that the obscurity resulting from this manner of speech may be removed.

1. *The Typical Sense.*—The typical sense of Scripture in general is the meaning the Holy Ghost intends to convey by means of the matter narrated. It is distinct from the literal meaning, because the latter is conveyed by the words themselves, while the former is expressed by the things signified by the words. The typical meaning is also called the spiritual, the mystical, the allegorical. The persons or things that God in his providence has ordained to signify the future events form the foundation of the typical sense. It follows from this that only he who has the free disposition of the future can employ a type in the strict sense of the word. For him alone have the present persons or things that connection with the future which the fœtus, e.g., in the course of its development, has with the fully organized body. The persons and things that God has thus assumed to signify future persons or things are called by St. Paul types, exemplars, shadows, allegories, parables; while the persons or things thus signified are named by St. Peter “anti-types,” though St. Paul gives this name to the former class also (Rom. v. 14; I. Cor. x. 6; Heb. viii. 5; Gal. iv. 24; Heb. ix. 9; I. Pet. iii. 21; Heb. ix. 24). The typical sense of Scripture thus explained is threefold: it either proposes certain dogmas of belief, commonly regarding the future Messias, and then we have the prophetic or allegorical types; or it describes the objects of our hope, especially concerning the future life in heaven, and this is effected by means of

anagogic types; or, finally, it shows us what we are bound to do by means of the so-called tropological types (cf. Gal. iv. 24; Wisd. xvi. 17; Apoc. xxi. 2). It must, however, be noted that there is a marked difference between the typical and the allegorical or spiritual meaning of the Scriptures: the latter terms are used by theological writers of all the interpretations that are not strictly literal, while the first term has its own specific sense. In order to have this specific character, the type must fulfil these three conditions: 1. It must have a proper and absolute historical existence, entirely independent of the anti-type. 2. It should not have a natural and essential reference to its anti-type. 3. God himself must have referred the type to its anti-type by means of a positive ordination. It is beyond all dispute that there are such types in the Scriptures: for proof we may refer to Rom. v. 14; Gal. iv. 24; Col. ii. 17; Heb. ix. 8, 9; Heb. vii.; i. 5; John xix. 36; Patrizi, p. 119.

2. *Allegorical Types*.—For the present we are principally concerned about the prophetic or the allegorical types. According to Eusebius (H. E. i. 3. M. 20, 72) the prophetic types of the Old Testament principally refer to the triple dignity of theocratic kingship, Aaronic priesthood, and divinely instituted prophetism. Hence the prophets describe the Messiah as the great theocratic king; and since in David, who is the Messiah's father as well as his type, they see a king according to God's own heart, they describe the Messiah as possessing the qualities of David—nay, they call the Messiah by David's own name. In a similar manner the Messiah is represented as the great prophet, who is to teach all nations, and as the eminent high-priest who will destroy all sin by offering himself as a victim. The unbloody sacrifice of the New Law is named by the same name as the unbloody sacrifices of the Old (Mal. i. 11). The Messianic kingdom is in the same manner represented by a series of pictures and figures taken from David's kingship. Jerusalem is the centre of the

Messianic kingdom, as it had been the capital of the theocratic reign; the Gentiles who are converted to the Messianic creed are said to flow to Mount Sion (Is. ii. ; Mich. v.), to be born on Sion (Ps. lxxxvi.), to find their salvation on Mount Sion and in Jerusalem (Joel ii. 32). The enemies of the Messianic kingdom bear the names of the tribes hostile to Jerusalem and the theocratic kingdom. In the New Law there will not be wanting priests and Levites to offer the burnt-offerings and the other sacrifices (Jer. xxxiii. 18), the sabbaths will be kept without intermission (Is. xvi. 23), all the nations will come to Jerusalem for the celebration of the Feast of Tabernacles (Zach. xiv. 16).

3. *Difference between Symbols and Types.*—The prophetic symbols must be carefully distinguished from the prophetic types. They agree in this with the types that they are persons or things assumed to signify something future; but they differ from the types mainly in their want of any historical existence. In themselves they were nothing but images shown to the prophets in order to reveal to them a part of the future. Thus Jeremias (xxiv.) saw two basketfuls of grapes, the one good, the other bad, to indicate the different fate that was to befall those that had been transported to Babylon and those that were still remaining in Jerusalem. Amos (viii.) saw under the figure of a hook which bringeth down the fruit, the approaching desolation of Israel caused by the nation's avarice and injustice. Isaias foreshows the shameful transportation of the Egyptians into Babylon by walking naked and barefoot. Jeremias breaks a potter's vessel, and thus announces the desolation of the Jews occasioned by their sins (Jer. xix.; Is. xx.). The use of imagery in the prophetic writings is also the reason of the dramatic nature of many prophecies—a characteristic to which St. Jerome (In Nah. ii. 1. M. 25, 1303; in Is. iii. 13; xxi. 3; in Jer. ix. 14. M. 24, 68, 196, 767) attributed in great part the obscurity of the predictions. In Isaias (lxiii.) the



prophet asks, "Who is this that cometh from Edom?" In answer the conqueror himself speaks: "I have trodden the winepress alone. . . ." And the prophet is in consequence incited to fervent prayer of thanksgiving: "I will remember the tender mercies of the Lord. . . ."

4. *How to recognize the Typical Meaning.*—It is in great part owing to the neglect of the prophetic types and symbols that the Jews did not recognize in Jesus the Messiah. Without considering that the kingdom of David is only a type of the Messianic kingdom, they expected a literal fulfilment in the person of the Messiah of all that had been said concerning his royal dignity. And if modern rationalists point out Messianic prophecies that have not been fulfilled in Jesus, they are generally taken from the typical predictions treating of the Messiah as the great king, the infallible prophet, and the universal high-priest. In order, however, to answer these objections we must briefly point out a few rules by which we may be enabled to distinguish between the typical, the symbolic, and the literal predictions.

a. If a prophecy has been evidently fulfilled, the event must show whether it was intended in a typical or a literal sense. Before the advent of Christ it was doubtful whether Ps. xxi. 13-17; eix. 7 were to be understood literally or typically. But after Christ's crucifixion all doubt has vanished.

b. Other prophecies are rendered clear by a comparison with parallel predictions. Thus the statement that the Messiah is to be a mighty warrior is explained by the other that he is the Prince of peace (Is. ix. 6; xi. 42); the typical character of the continued existence of the Levitical priesthood and of the Old Testament sacrifices is evident from the literal predictions announcing the end of priesthood and sacrifices alike (Jer. xxxiii. 18; Is. lvi. 6; lx. 7; Ezech. xl.-xlviii.; Jer. iii. 16; xxxi. 31; Mal. i. 11, etc.); that the Messiah is not David in a literal sense is plain from those passages in which he is called the son of David.

*c.* If the literal acceptance of a prophecy would destroy the very nature of the person or thing of which there is question, we must seek for a typical or a symbolic meaning (cf. Corn. a Lap., *Proleg. in Prophet. Can.* v.; Forer. in *Is.* xlv. 8). St. Jerome (in *Is.* xi. 6. *M.* 24, 150 f.), writing against the Christian millenarians (St. Justin, *c. Tryph.* 81. *M.* 6, 668; St. Iren., *c. hæc.* v. 33, *M.* 7, 1214; Lactant., *Instit.* vii. 24. *M.* 6, 809; cf. Hengstenberg, *Christol.* ii. pp. 138 ff.; Delitzsch, "*Isaias*," pp. 188 f.; Nägelsbach, "*Isaias*," p. 148), ridicules all those who expect a literal fulfilment of *Is.* xi. 6: "The wolf shall dwell with the lamb . . ." Cornely is of opinion that the same must be said of the literal fulfilment of *Is.* ii. 2; *Mich.* v. 2 against all those who believe that at the end of time Mount Sion will be placed on the top of all other mountains, or that all other mountains will disappear, Sion alone remaining (cf. Cornely, *Intr.* II. ii. p. 304; Hofmann, "*Erfüllung und Weissagung*," ii. p. 217; Delitzsch, "*Isaias*," p. 61; Nägelsbach, "*Isaias*," p. 148).

*d.* Finally, all those predictions that allude to facts of the Jewish history must be understood in a typical rather than in a literal sense. Thus we read: "If the Lord shall wash away the filth of the daughters of Sion, and shall wash away the blood of Jerusalem out of the midst thereof, by the spirit of judgment and by the spirit of burning. And the Lord will create upon every place of Mount Sion, and where he is called upon, a cloud by day, and a smoke and the brightness of a flaming fire in the night" (*Is.* iv. 4, 5). At times the typical nature of the prophetic prediction is indicated in the words of the text itself (cf. *Zach.* x. 11, Hebrew text), and thus all difficulty is removed (cf. Reinke, *Beiträge*, ii. pp. 50-59; Hengstenberg, *Christologie*, iii. 2, 203 ff.; Cornely, *Intr.* II. ii. pp. 288 ff.; Meignan, "*Les Prophéties dans les deux premiers ch. des Rois*," pp. 12-75).

5. *The Figurative Sense.*—What has been said about the interpretation of the typical and the symbolic sense of

the prophetic predictions applies in a measure also to the figurative or the metaphorical sense. Since the style of the prophets is to some extent poetical, as has been seen above, in the interpretation allowance must be made for figures of speech and poetic ornament of language. It may show great devotion to inquire why Jeremias (xxiv. 1) saw two baskets of grapes rather than of any other fruit, or why Isaias in his description of the Prince of peace (xi. 6) mentions the sheep and the wolf rather than other animals; but it is very uncertain whether we shall ever be able to arrive at any certainty in these minutiae (cf. Knabenbauer, "*Der Prophet Isaias*," pp. 170 f.; 180). It seems much preferable to ascribe them to the poetic language of the prophet.



# PART I.

## *GENEALOGY OF THE MESSIAS.*

---

### CHAPTER I.

THE MESSIAS IS THE SON OF GOD. PS. II.

#### INTRODUCTION.

**1. POSITION OF PS. II.**—In several Hebrew manuscripts the first and second psalms are united so as to form only one psalm; in others the second stands first in numerical order. The Greek editions of the New Testament by Erasmus, Bengel, and Griesbach consider our first psalm as a kind of introduction to the whole psalter, and begin their numbering with our second psalm. They do so on the authority of several Latin and Greek Fathers, who quote the seventh verse of Ps. ii. as occurring in Ps. i. But the greater number of manuscripts and editions of the New Testament, the Vulgate and the Oriental versions among the rest, quote the passage as taken from Ps. ii. A few manuscripts omit the number entirely (cf. Acts xiii. 33).

**2. STRUCTURE OF PS. II.**—In the Hebrew text this psalm consists of four stanzas, the first three of which contain seven trochaic hexasyllabic verses each, while the fourth

numbers eight. In the first stanza the psalmist beholds a multitude of kings and nations in rebellion against Jehovah and his Anointed; in the second Jehovah derides the insurgents, and declares that he has established his Anointed as king in Sion; in the third the Anointed claims an absolute dominion over all the nations of the earth by right of inheritance; in the fourth the psalmist exhorts the kings to serve and fear Jehovah, in order to escape his angry vengeance (cf. Cheyne, "Book of Psalms," pp. 3 f.).

**3. AUTHOR OF THE PSALM.**—Opinions: 1.—The psalm was written by Asaph, the prophet, when the Ammonites and other nations, in league with them, conspired against the kingdom of Israel and the king Josaphat (II. Paral. xx. Rüdinger). There is no solid foundation for this opinion.

2. The author is an unknown person, who speaks of one of the later Hebrew kings (Hensler). But greater power and glory is predicted of Sion's anointed king than were enjoyed by any of the kings of Juda or Israel after Solomon's time.

3. Nathan the prophet wrote the second psalm at the time when Adonias, the son of David by Haggith, exalted himself, saying: "I will be king" (III. Kings i. 5). The psalmist intended to prevent the meditated rebellion by persuading his countrymen to embrace the interests of their divinely appointed king, Solomon (Anonym. author). But even if we grant that the word "kings" may designate persons ambitious of becoming kings, we cannot understand how it can apply to Adonias alone, or how the word "Gentiles" (*Goyim* in Hebrew) can be used of the Israelitic tribes. The denunciations too are of a severer character than they would have been had they been addressed to the Jews.

4. The opinion that Ps. ii. was written by Solomon (Ewald, Paulus, Bleek, etc.), or by Ezechias (Maurer), or by Isaias, or at the time of Isaias (Delitzsch), hardly needs to be discussed, since the reasons establishing the psalm's



true authorship will sufficiently answer all the arguments of our opponents.

5. King David is the author of the second psalm. Proofs: *a.* In Acts iv. 25 the beginning of Ps. ii. is introduced with the words, "who by the Holy Ghost, by the mouth of our father David, thy servant, hath said." Compare also Acts xiii. 33, 34. *b.* The first forty, or, according to the Hebrew text, the first forty-one psalms constitute what is known as the first book of the psalter, which was, according to the more common opinion, written by David. In the Hebrew text thirty-seven psalms out of the forty-one are ascribed to David in the titles of the Psalms. *c.* The second psalm is very similar to Ps. cix. (ex.), which latter was beyond all doubt composed by David (cf. Ps. ii. 7 and cix. 2, 5, 6). *d.* Supposing the Messianic character of the second psalm, which we shall establish in the next paragraph, its description of the anointed king fits very well into the time of David. *e.* Jewish tradition, too, ascribes the psalm to David, as may be seen from the words of Solomon Jarchi and David Kimchi. If Aben Ezra ascribes it to "some of the minstrels," still he insists that it has reference "to David at the time when he was chosen king." Driver (Introduction to the Literat. O. T., pp. 362 f., note) does not consider that David is both prophet and king.

**4. SUBJECT OF THE PSALM.**—The subject of the second psalm is identical with the "anointed king." Opinions: 1. All Catholics must hold that the "anointed king" is, at least, a type of the Messiah; that, therefore, the subject of the psalm, at least in its typical meaning, is Christ Jesus. Reasons: *a.* Such is the tradition of the Synagogue Jarchi says: "Our doctors expound this psalm as having reference to King Messiah; but in accordance with the literal sense, and that it may be used against the heretics [i.e., the Christians,] it is proper that it be explained as relating to David himself." David Kimchi expresses himself as follows in the exposition of this psalm: "There

are some," says he, "who expound this psalm as referring to Gog and Magog; and that the anointed king is the Messiah. Our doctors of blessed memory thus expounded it, and the psalm so explained is very perspicuous; yet it seems more reasonable to think that David composed it in reference to himself, and in this sense we have accordingly explained it" (cf. Coroll. 1A). *b.* Christian tradition agrees on this point with the Jewish; the Fathers of the Church have made use of the second psalm in proving the divinity of Christ against the Arians (cf. Kilber, "*Analysis Biblia*," ii. 8, 2d ed.). *c.* The psalm is applied to Christ in the New Testament (cf. Acts iv. 25-27; xiii. 33; Heb. i. 5; v. 5; Apoc. xix. 15).

2. Many Catholic and some Protestant commentators maintain that the anointed king and all that is said of him refers literally to the Messiah. Reasons: *a.* From the above cited passages of Jarchi and Kimchi it appears that such was the Jewish tradition. *b.* The whole psalm in its literal sense well agrees with the Messiah; the literal sense of several of its clauses cannot apply to any one else, e.g., "this day have I begotten thee," and "I will give thee the Gentiles for thy inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for thy possession." *c.* The fact that the terms "Christ" (Messiah) and "Son of God" became proper names of the expected Redeemer (John iv. 25; i. 49) is owing to the second psalm. This is also another proof that the Jews understood the psalm in its literal sense of the Messiah. *d.* Ps. cix. (cx.), which is similar to Ps. ii., is commonly explained as referring in its literal sense to the Messiah. A like explanation must then be given of the second psalm.

3. Patrizi is of opinion that part of the psalm taken in its literal sense applies to the Messiah, part to King Solomon. The reasons given in the preceding paragraph lead him to the partial Messianic interpretation, while the words of the prophet Nathan, "I will be to him a father, and he shall be to me a son" (II. Kings vii. 14), spoken as

they are of Solomon, establish in his opinion the Solomonic relation of the psalm. Thus type and anti-type are blended into one.

4. Some expositors have thought that Solomon is the king celebrated in this song (Ewald, Bleek, etc.). Reasons: *a.* In II. Kings vii. 13, 14, Solomon is called "son of God." *b.* Among all the kings of Israel Solomon was the only one, so far as we know, who, after being anointed at the fountain Gihon, was brought up with royal pomp to Mount Sion. *c.* It may be supposed that in the beginning of Solomon's reign the subdued surrounding nations would attempt to free themselves from the power of the Israelite king. This rebellion, being of but short duration, has not been mentioned in any of Israel's historical books. This last reason, however, is nothing but a gratuitous conjecture in support of a favorite hypothesis. It is stated in explicit terms in III. Kings v. 4, 5 and I. Paral. xxii. 9 that Solomon's reign was a period of profound peace. Again Ps. lxxxviii. 27, 28 promises that God will make David his "first-born, high above the kings of the earth." The above reasons, then, do not prove that the second psalm, in its literal meaning, must apply to Solomon.

5. Another class of writers maintains that David is the subject of the second psalm. Reasons: *a.* David is often called the anointed, as in II. Kings xii. 7; Ps. xix. (xx.) 7. *b.* David wielded his royal power on Mount Sion (I. Par. xv. 1; xvi. 1). *c.* There were several periods in David's reign that agree with the description given in the psalm: 1. The period when David was attacked by the army of the Philistines, after he had taken the stronghold of the Jebusites (Jarchi, Kimchi) (cf. II. Kings v. 20). 2. When David had gained the victory over the Philistines, Moabites, Syrians, and the other neighboring nations (cf. II. Kings viii. 1-15) (Grotius, Möller, etc.). 3. When the Benjamites together with Saul's family supported Ishboseth against David (Döderlein). 4. When David's son Absalom conspired against his father (Kuinoel, etc.).

*d.* The psalmist, whom we have identified with David, writes as of actual and present occurrences. But we must remember, on the one hand, that the prophetic vision commonly presents future scenes as actually present; we must consider, on the other, that at the time of the first of the above victories over the Philistines Sion was not as yet the Holy Mount, since the ark of the covenant did not then rest on Sion (cf. II. Kings vi. 1). As to the subsequent victories of David, they did not subdue rebellious nations, previously subject to David's sway, as the psalm describes it; but they were gained over the independent surrounding tribes and the members of his own family. Though David was anointed he did not receive his consecration on Mount Sion, but first in Bethlehem and later at Hebron (I. Kings xvi. 1-3; II. Kings ii. 1-4).

To sum up, the second psalm was written by David, and refers to the Messiah, probably in its literal sense. By this is not excluded the opinion that some particular external occurrence or a chain of such occurrences was the immediate occasion of the psalm. Nor is the opinion of those writers who apply the psalm only in its typical sense to Christ destitute of probability. Delitzsch (*Commentar über den Psalter*, vol. i. p. 9) well expresses the result of his investigation. "The question concerning the person of the Anointed," he says, "need not detain us long; for in the labyrinth of opinions one point remains certain beyond all doubt: that the person of the Anointed, in whom the whole psalm centres, appears in that divine splendor of power which the prophet predicted of the Messiah. Whether it be a present or a future king . . . who is thus considered in the light of the Messianic prophecies, in either case the Anointed is according to the psalmist's mind the person of the Messiah" (cf. Cheyne, "*Book of Psalms*," p. 4).

## Ps. II.

<sup>1</sup> Why have the Gentiles <sup>2</sup> raged <sup>3</sup>,  
And the people devised vain things?

<sup>1</sup> **First Stanza.** The dramatic nature of the psalm manifests itself by the abrupt exordium and the stage-like change of speakers. The prophet begins by picturing in general outlines his vision of the world's rebellion against Jehovah and his Anointed. Then the rebels give utterance to their complaints and designs. The full meaning of the first stanza will best appear by a study and comparison of its parallel terms: "Gentiles" and "people," "ragcd" and "devised vain things," "kings" and "princes," "stood up" and "met together," "the Lord" and "his Christ," "break" and "cast away," "bonds" and "yoke."

<sup>2</sup> **Gentiles—People.** The Hebrew plural for "Gentiles," "Goyim," without a qualifying noun or adjective, is never used of the Hebrew race alone. In the singular number the word denotes the Israelitic people in Gen. xii. 2; Jos. iii. 17; Is. i. 4, etc. The plural always either includes non-Hebrew tribes or is accompanied by a modifying phrase. Gen. xvii. 16 and Ezech. ii. 3 form no exceptions. The Rabbinic writers employ "Goyim" for all non-Hebrew nations. The Hebrew word for people, "leummim," is a synonym of "Goyim," and denotes strange nations. In the present passage it was interpreted by the early Christians as referring to the tribes of Israel (Acts iv. 27); that this interpretation was given by divine inspiration is not certain, though it is probable. Perhaps it was owing to their rejection of the Messiah that the Hebrews had been designated in prophecy by a name that was proper to an unhallowed people. Eusebius, St. Cyril, and St. Jerome apply the word to the degenerate Israelites.

<sup>3</sup> **Raged—Devised vain things.** The word translated by "ragcd" denotes the tumultuous noise of a multitude, when murmurs of rage and threatening break forth into curses and deeds of violence. The corresponding Arabic verb expresses the loud bellowing of the camel, the roar of the sea, and the crash of thunder. In Syriac too the word with its derivatives denotes a loud, crashing, roaring noise. The word used in the Hebrew text for "devised" seems to have first signified what is accompanied by great heat; applied to internal actions it meant intense thought, which according to Aben Ezra breaks forth into words. Its object in the psalm is "vain things," in Hebrew "riq." Venema insists on the primitive meaning of "riq," saliva or spittle, the emission of which is, according to his opinion, a sign of anger (cf. Job i. 22; xxiv. 12). But the learned author has been deceived in his derivation of the Hebrew word. In point of fact, the primitive meaning of "riq" is "empty," "vain." Hufnagel's translation, "wickedness," is without foundation, and has been rightly opposed by learned critics, especially by Eichhorn. Judges ix. 4; xi. 3; vii. 16; II. Par. xii. 7; and IV. Kings. iv. 3 are passages which illustrate the meaning of "empty" rather than of "wicked."

The <sup>4</sup> kings of the earth <sup>6</sup> stood up,  
 And the princes met together.  
 Against the <sup>6</sup> Lord, and against his Christ.  
 "Let us <sup>7</sup> break their <sup>8</sup> bonds asunder,  
 And let us cast away their yoke from us."

**<sup>4</sup> Kings—Princes.** The "kings of the earth" are not merely the petty kings of the neighboring Canaanitish tribes, or the Philistine and Syrian princes, as Grotius has explained the phrase (cf. Jos. xiii. 3; Judg. iii. 3; xvi. 5, 8; 1. Kings vi. 18; 11. Kings viii. x.), but the kings and sovereigns of foreign nations, as we must conclude from Ps. ii. 8 and Ps. lxxi. (lxxii.) 8-11. The literal meaning of the word translated "princes" is "men of weight"; but its more specific signification of "kings" or "princes" is not uncommon (cf. Judg. v. 3; Prov. viii. 15; xxxi. 4; Is. xl. 23). St. Athanasius, St. Hilary, Rupertus, and Arias explain the phrases as denoting Herod and Pilate, Annas and Caiphas, respectively (cf. Cheyne, "Book of Psalms," p. 5).

**<sup>5</sup> Stood up—Met together.** The phrase "stood up against" in its Hebrew form generally means "to stand before," "to attend upon," "to serve," as may be seen from Job i. 6; ii. 1; Zach. vi. 5; 11. Par. xi. 13; the context shows that in the present passage it must be taken in a bad sense, denoting the uprising of rebels. The parallel phrase translated "met together," according to Venema and Michaelis primarily signifies "to recline upon a pillow." Then it denotes also the rest on the couches placed, in Eastern countries, around the walls, on which friends sit to converse or to hold council. Hence it derives its meaning of "deliberating" or "taking counsel." The Turks use a similar figure when they speak of holding a "Divan."

**<sup>6</sup> Lord—Christ.** According to the theocratic system of government, Jehovah was Israel's supreme king, who ruled the nation by his anointed deputy (cf. 1. Kings x. 17 f. and 1. Kings xvi. 1 ff., concerning Saul and David). The Hebrew kings therefore held their office directly from Jehovah, whose official consecration they obtained by being anointed. In this regard the office of king was as distinctly divine as that of prophet or priest. Some writers explain Jehovah as designating God the Father, in order to distinguish from him the Anointed, his son, the more clearly. The conjecture that the light of reason is meant by Jehovah hardly needs refutation. Concerning the various views about the Anointed, enough has been said in the introductory paragraphs.

**<sup>7</sup> Break asunder—Cast away.** The word used in the Hebrew text for "break" stands in the intensive form, and from its emphatic ending may be seen the firm determination of the rebel nations and princes to proceed to acts of violence. From Jer. xxii. 24; Judg. xvi. 9, etc., as well as from the corresponding Arabic word, it is plain that we might translate the Hebrew verb by "pull off" or "draw out," instead of "break." The emphatic ending is also found in the Hebrew text of the verb "cast away."

**<sup>8</sup> Bonds—Yoke.** The words translated "bonds" and "yoke" are perhaps more exactly rendered "chains" and "ropes." Some think that the Psalmist alludes to the chains which outgoing armies used



<sup>1</sup>He that <sup>2</sup>dwelleth in heaven shall <sup>3</sup>laugh at them,  
 And the Lord shall deride them.  
 Then shall he <sup>4</sup>speak to them in his anger,

to carry in order to bind the prisoners of war that might fall into their hands (Paulus); others look upon the chains and chords as general symbols of dominion (Rosenmüller); others again see in them the sign of fixed resolve or counsel (Kimchi, Anonym, etc.); others think they signify the hardness of Jehovah's service for the impenitent sinner. Its sweetness to the men of good-will appears from Ps. cxviii. (cxix.) and Luke xix. 14. Flaminius, Arias, and St. Augustine explain the bonds as meaning the law of God.

<sup>1</sup> **Second Stanza.** The second stanza is the exact counterpart of the first. It begins with the general description of the effect that the rebellion produces on Jehovah, and then introduces the Lord himself speaking. The parallel phrases are: "he that dwelleth in heaven" and "the Lord," "laugh" and "deride," "speak in anger" and "trouble in his rage."

<sup>2</sup> **Dwelleth . . .—Lord.** To emphasize from the start the contemptible smallness of the kings and princes of the earth, the Psalmist points out to them that their Lord dwelleth in heaven. The Hebrew text suggests, moreover, a sitting, quiet posture of the heavenly Lord. Whether the prophet mentally located heaven in the sky or conceived it as we do, does not affect the sense of the present passage. The anthropomorphic representation of God is in keeping with the vivid earnestness of the prophet.

<sup>3</sup> **Laugh—Deride.** In the Hebrew text we read "shall laugh" instead of "shall laugh at them." Hubigant and Köhler were of opinion that the object after laugh should be supplied in the Hebrew text. But it is omitted in the Chaldaic and Syriac versions too, so that it must have been wanting in the Hebrew text at a very early date. The present reading gives a beautiful climax. The Lord first laughs, smiles, as it were in compassion; then he derides his enemies; next he speaks to them in anger, and finally troubles them in his rage. St. Jerome remarks that the Lord does not really deride any one, but that his enemies render themselves worthy of derision. Venerable Bede, Alexander of Hales, Dennis the Carthusian, and Bredenbach think that the deriding refers to the day of judgment (Cheyne, "Book of Psalms," p. 5).

<sup>4</sup> **Speak in anger—Trouble in rage.** Kimchi and Aben Ezra mention some Jewish writers who render the Hebrew of the phrase "he shall speak to them" by "he shall destroy their mighty men." The verb found in this phrase has the meaning of destroying also in II. Par. xxii. 10. But the second part of the expression nowhere else signifies "mighty men," or heroes. Ezech. xvii. 13, pointed out as a parallel instance, has a reading somewhat different from Ps. ii. 5. Kennicott's manuscript, marked No. 76, and dating from the thirteenth century, is the only copy the text of which would allow the above rendering. But since there is question only of an additional letter, "yodh," we may ascribe its presence to the negligence of a transcriber. The parallel expression, "shall trouble," is rendered by Michaelis as "shall curse," on account of the meaning of the corre-

And trouble them in his rage.  
 "But <sup>6</sup> I am appointed king by him  
 Over <sup>6</sup> Sion, his holy mountain,

sponding verb in Arabic. This translation being without foundation, we must adhere to the Hebrew use of the word. It expresses first a hasty precipitate movement, as in I. Esdras iv. 23 and Eccles. v. 1; then it includes the troubled state of mind that accompanies haste in movement, as in I. Kings xxviii. 21; Ps. lxxxii. 16; Jer. li. 32. Faber imagines that Jehovah's speaking to the rebels and troubling them refers to thunder and lightning. All this he infers from the fact that in I. Kings vii. 10, the "voice of Jehovah" is used in the sense of thunder. Venerable Bede applies the phrase "he shall speak to them in his anger" to the words of the last judgment: "Depart from me." Dennis the Carthusian and others hold that the judicial condemnation to eternal punishment is referred to in the words "he shall trouble them in his rage." Schegg maintains that Jehovah derided his enemies, the Pharisees and the members of the Sanhedrin, when he confounded them before the multitudes and silenced them through the instrumentality of simple fishermen; that he spoke to them in his anger in the destruction of Jerusalem; that he again derided his enemies, the pagan emperors and judges, by miraculously sustaining, keeping, and healing the martyrs; and finally, that he again spoke in anger by the destruction of paganism through the influence of Christianity.

<sup>5</sup> **I am appointed king.** The words that immediately follow "I am appointed king" are actively construed in the Hebrew text, in the versions of St. Jerome, Aquila, Symmachus, and in the Chaldee and Syriac readings. Accordingly, we must translate "I have anointed, or constituted my king." Against those writers who insist on the correctness of the Septuagint and Vulgate versions, as agreeing with differently pointed Hebrew manuscripts, we may appeal to the impropriety of such a translation. If faithfully rendered, it must read: "But I am appointed my king by him over Sion, my holy mountain." For even if it be granted that the "my" of the phrase "my king" may be explained as a mere paragogic affix, no faithful version has a right to substitute "his holy mountain" for "my holy mountain." Aben Ezra rightly remarks that to anoint is, in this passage, equivalent to constituting in royal power.

<sup>6</sup> **Sion, his holy mountain.** Sion is called Jehovah's holy mountain, not because the temple was built on it, for Mount Moria was the temple-mount, but because the sanctuary had been there before Solomon's time (cf. II. Kings vi. 17). The suggestion of Rosenmüller that the Hebrew phrase should be translated "upon the hill of my exaltation" appears to be groundless. A learned anonymous author supposes that Sion is here mentioned because it had been the first among David's many conquests. But this opinion serves merely to prepare the way for his Solomonic interpretation of Ps. ii. without resting on solid arguments. Whether the phrase "over Sion his holy mountain" grammatically depends on the verb "I have anointed" or on the noun "king," cannot be decided from the text. Both explanations are probable, and give substantially the same meaning.

<sup>1</sup> Preaching <sup>8</sup> his <sup>9</sup> commandment."

Sts. Jerome and Hilary understand the Church by "Mount Sion." St. Augustine says that the Church is called Sion on account of her firmness and pre-eminence. The figure is a common one in biblical and ecclesiastical literature.

<sup>7</sup> **Preaching.** Instead of the phrase "preaching his commandment," we read in the Hebrew text "I will declare the commandment, or the saying." In all probability, a new speaker, the anointed king, here interrupts Jehovah and continues his discourse. Stridsberg conjectures that the whole phrase is nothing but a marginal note, indicating a change of speakers, which has been incorporated into the text. There is no foundation for this conjecture. The fact that our present Hebrew text differs from that of the Septuagint, of Theodotion, Aquila, and St. Jerome has led to a variety of explanations. Köhler thinks that in ancient Hebrew manuscripts the participle must have been found instead of the first person singular; Bickell places the clause "I will declare the decree of Jehovah" before "I have been appointed king by him over Sion, my holy mountain." Michaelis goes so far as to introduce a preposition and a noun instead of the verb; he translates "from the book of God, a statute of Jehovah." Rosenmüller appeals to the Syriac version, in which no change of speakers takes place, and "my commandment" is read instead of "commandment." Hence he suggests the translation "I will cause him to preach my commandment." Another explanation of the phrase is offered by Faber, who thinks that the Hebrew verb used in this passage may mean "to cut out," "to engrave." He translates: "I will inscribe upon a monument what Jehovah hath said to me."

<sup>8</sup> **His commandment.** The Septuagint version renders the whole phrase "declaring the decree of the Lord, The Lord hath said to me." It repeats "the Lord," and thus differs from the Hebrew text. Hubigant and Knappe suppose "the Lord" had been once omitted in the Hebrew text through the carelessness of the transcribers. Bickell translates by "my God" what is usually rendered "to me" (my God hath said). See the third stanza. Michaelis repeats "el" instead of "Jehovah." For "el" precedes the noun that we translate by "commandment," and thus serves, according to Kimchi, as a sign of the direct object, though taken in its usual sense the preposition means "according to." Fischer suggests the translation "I will declare what God hath said according to commandment;" Venema renders it "I will declare the truth;" Ernesti translates "I will speak according as the matter really stands." Other writers transpose the noun and preposition, rendering: "I will declare (or declaring) the commandment of God."

<sup>9</sup> **Commandment.** Patrizi and Ewald tell us that the "decree" or "command" referred to in this passage is the prophecy of Nathan as given in II. Kings vii. 14 (cf. I. Par. xvii. 13; xxii. 10, and Ps. lxxxviii. (lxxxix.) 27). The more common opinion points to the words of the psalm that immediately follow as constituting the decree in question. Bickell places, as we have seen, the last verse, "I will declare the decree of Jehovah," before the words "I have appointed my king," etc., so that these last words form the beginning of the decree.

<sup>1</sup> The Lord hath said to me : "Thou art my son,"<sup>2</sup>

<sup>3</sup> This day have I begotten thee.

Ask of me, and I will give thee

<sup>1</sup> **Third Stanza.** The third stanza contains in all probability the decree of Jehovah which the anointed king promulgates. Its parallel terms are the following : "my son" and "this day I have begotten thee," "the Gentiles" and "the utmost parts of the earth," "inheritance" and "possession," "rule with a rod of iron" and "break in pieces like a potter's vessel." Bickell lets the stanza begin with the words : "God has said," omitting "to me."

<sup>2</sup> **My Son.** Rosenmüller (cf. Cheyne, Book of Psalms, p. 5) thinks that the anointed king is called the son of God, because according to the theocratic conceptions of the Jews their king held his authority from God himself, and was gifted with extraordinary wisdom, prudence, intrepidity, and, in a word, with all the gifts that befit a good monarch. For similar reasons the Grecian kings were said by Homer to have been born of God or to be nourished by God. But following the teaching of St. Paul (Heb. i. 5), all Catholics maintain that the word "son" in this passage implies natural sonship. The Fathers of the Church too agree on this point, all excluding the idea of merely adoptive sonship.

<sup>3</sup> **This day.** But there exists no such agreement concerning the parallel term "this day have I begotten thee." I. Cassiodorus, Muis, Reinke, Crellier, Patrizi, St. Athanasius, and St. Augustine explain the passage as referring to the eternal generation of the Son by the Father. Heb. i. 5 implies the same interpretation; at least it excludes the temporal and figurative generation other authors give as the true explanation of the passage. According to this view, the phrase "to-day" indicates the eternal continuity of the divine generation (cf. Is. xliii. 13, where "to-day" is rendered "from the beginning" by the Septuagint).

2. Sts. Cyprian, Chrysostom, Jerome, Fulgentius, and after them Steenkiste, and several others understand the generation of the anointed king by Jehovah as applying to the incarnation, the incarnating action being ascribed to God the Father. "To-day" must then signify the definite point of time at which the mystery of the incarnation took place (cf. Cheyne, p. 5).

3. St. Hilary, Theodore of Antioch, Angellius, Jansenius of Ghent, a Lapide, Vasquez, Schegg, and others think that the phrase "I have begotten thee" has reference to the resurrection of the anointed king, since the resurrection, more than any other event, manifested the fact of the anointed king's natural sonship of God. This interpretation is based on the argument of St. Paul given in Acts xiii. 33; it is confirmed by the fact that Jesus declared on the day of his resurrection (Matt. xxviii. 18) that all power in heaven and on earth was given to him. Some writers point also to Rom. i. 4, and to the analogy that exists between birth and resurrection as to additional proofs for this third interpretation.

4. Beelen explained the generation of the Son by the Father spoken of in the second psalm as the manifestation of the Son by the Father, saying: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased" (Matt.

The 'Gentiles for thy <sup>5</sup>inheritance,  
 And the utmost parts of the earth for thy possession.  
 Thou shalt <sup>6</sup>rule them with a rod <sup>7</sup>of iron,  
 And shalt break them in pieces like a potter's vessel."

iii. 17). The passage in Acts xiii. 32, 33 is explained by the authors who agree with Beelen as meaning: The promise which was made to our fathers God has fulfilled for our children, in constituting (showing, manifesting) Jesus, as is written in the second psalm. Dathe, after explaining St. Paul's words in the above way, applies the manifestation in question to the surrender of the Gentiles into the power of the Son.

Finally, we must compare the Psalmist's words with St. John's gospel (i. 14): "and the word was made flesh, and dwelt amongst us: and we saw his glory, the glory, as it were, of the ONLY-BEGOTTEN OF THE FATHER, full of grace and truth," and with Heb. i. 8: "but to the Son: thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of justice is the sceptre of thy kingdom."

<sup>4</sup> **Gentiles—Utmost parts.** What must be understood by the Gentiles promised to the Son is plain from the parallel terms "the utmost parts of the earth." Some writers explain this last phrase of Palestine alone by comparing it with Deut. xxxiii. 17 and Amos viii. 12. But a comparison with I. Kings ii. 10; Ps. xxi. (xxii.) 28; lxvi. (lxvii.) 8; lxxi. (lxxii.) 8; Prov. xxx. 4, as well as the authority of Haymo, Bellarmine, and numerous other interpreters lead us to apply the passage to the whole earth, or to all its inhabitants. Christ seems to allude to this psalm in the words: "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth" (Matt. xxviii. 18); and again, "you shall be witnesses unto me in Jerusalem, and in Judea, and in Samaria, and even to the utmost part of the earth" (Acts i. 8; cf. Cheyne, "Book of Psalms," p. 6).

<sup>5</sup> **Inheritance—Possession.** "Inheritance" and "possession" differ in this, that the former denotes what is possessed by virtue of sonship; the latter, whatever is held by right of property or dominion (cf. Gen. xlvii. 11 and Lev. xiv. 34). As to the stability of the inheritance among the Jews, compare Num. xxiii. 1–11; xxxvi., and especially Lev. xxv. 13 and xxvii. 24.

<sup>6</sup> **Rule—Break.** Instead of the phrase "thou shalt rule," which is found in the Vulgate, Ethiopic, and Syriac versions, and also in St. Jerome's translation, the Chaldee version reads: "thou shalt break them in pieces." Döderlein, Köhler, Ilgen, and many other scholars interpret the passage as the former versions do; but they must either change the Hebrew vowel-points or admit an unusual grammatical form in the text. Taking the text as it is, and not recurring to a merely possible verb-formation, we must render the passage in accordance with the Chaldee version. Jarchi and Kimchi too agree with the version "thou shalt break," "thou shalt dash them." Moreover, the parallel member "thou shalt break them in pieces" requires a similar meaning in the first phrase. Since there is question only of the rebellious subjects, we cannot infer any harshness of the Messianic rule from this interpretation. Christ's treatment of his faithful servants is not described in the psalm.

<sup>7</sup> **Rod of iron.** The phrase "rod of iron" some writers interpret as



And now, O ye kings, understand,  
 Receive instruction you that judge the earth.  
 Serve ye the Lord with fear,  
 And <sup>2</sup>rejoice unto him with trembling.

<sup>3</sup> Embrace discipline, lest at any time the <sup>4</sup> Lord be angry

"sceptre of iron" (Steenkiste); others explain it as the iron shepherd's crook (Stange); others again see in it a staff or club of iron (Lackemacher), while Bellarmine and Lindau translate the passage "with an iron power." It must be remarked that the expression does not necessarily imply a sceptre or rod of iron, but it may refer to an instrument studded with iron (cf. Cheyne, "Book of Psalms," p. 6). The potter's vessel was proverbial for its fragility and uselessness after breaking. Hence the anointed king will destroy his enemies with ease, and ruin them thoroughly (cf. St. John xxvii. 1, 2: "Father, . . . glorify thy son . . . : as thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he may give eternal life to all").

<sup>1</sup> **Fourth Stanza.** The fourth stanza contains an address of the Psalmist to the kings of the earth. Calmet tells us that the persons here addressed are variously interpreted. Some commentators think that the Psalmist addresses all kings in general; others restrict the meaning to the rebel kings, of whom there was question in the first stanza; others again follow St. Jerome, who applies the prophet's warning to the apostles, the princes and rulers of the Church. "Judges of the earth" is a term parallel to the word "king." Instead of the two phrases "understand" and "receive instruction," the better reading is "act wisely" and "receive correction;" for the Hebrew text suggests this latter meaning.

<sup>2</sup> **Rejoice with trembling.** The passage which is commonly translated "rejoice unto him with trembling" has given rise to a great variety of opinions. Instead of the first part of the phrase, Rudinger periphrastically translates "rejoice in him and in your worship of him;" Campensis, "rejoice that you have obtained such a king;" Hgen, "trembling consecrate to him joyous dances;" Abul Walid, "be ye moved with trembling;" Schulz, "surround him;" Paulus, "rejoice abundantly;" Michaelis, "exult with fear;" and finally Jarchi paraphrases the passage as follows: "since fear shall take hold of hypocrites, do ye then exult and rejoice, if ye worship the Lord?" The meaning of joy and exultation is on the whole the most probable, indicating that the Lord must be served with fear, but that the fear should be a filial fear. But Hengstenberg is wrong when he thinks of a merely external manifestation of gladness. Both the signification of the words and the dignity of Jehovah require truly internal sentiments of joy (cf. Os. x. 5).

<sup>3</sup> **Embrace discipline.** The next verse, which reads in our translation "embrace discipline," has wonderfully exercised the ingenuity of interpreters. The Vulgate version follows the Septuagint; the Arabic and Chaldee versions too interpret the passage in nearly the same way, rendering it "adhere to discipline" and "receive ye discipline" (instruction) (cf. Bammidbar Rabba, 10, and Sanhedrin 92a). We must infer from these renderings that the former Hebrew text differed from the present. For if we adhere faithfully to the



And you perish <sup>5</sup> from the just way  
 When <sup>6</sup> his wrath shall be kindled in a short time.  
 Blessed are all they that shall trust in him.

present Hebrew reading, we must render "kiss ye the son." This rendering is found in Pesh. and Aben-Ezra; St. Jerome in his commentary renders "adore (adulate) the son." The explanations offered by Cappell, the younger Buxtorf, Viccars, and other scholars are nothing but conjecture. For some change the Hebrew word "nashsheku" (kiss ye) into "nassequ" (obtain, overtake ye), while others maintain that the expression "kiss ye" metaphorically signifies "embrace," since we eagerly lay hold upon whatever we kiss. Aquila translates the passage "venerate in sincerity;" Symmachus, "worship in purity;" St. Jerome, "adore with purity;" Döderlein and Ilgen, "kiss ye him whom he hath chosen;" Brüll and Cheyne amend the text into "seek ye his face;" Drusius paraphrases the verse: "Receive this person as your lord and king, and yield him the obedience and fidelity of subjects." To understand this last interpretation better we must call to mind that among the Hebrews the kiss was in ancient times the symbol of the highest respect. Thus were idols worshipped, as we see from III. Kings xix. 18 and Osee xiii. 2; and thus, too, were kings acknowledged, as appears from I. Kings x. 1 (cf. Luke vii. 38). Job also shows that among the Hebrews "to kiss" often had the meaning of worshipping (xxxi. 26, 27). Comparing now the context of the passage in question, it seems probable that we must adhere to the strict Hebrew text, "kiss (i.e., worship, or do royal homage to) the son." The interpretation of Genebrard and Titelmann, "embrace the doctrine," has had a certain celebrity in its own day. Bickell looks upon the words as an interpolated gloss, merely intended to show the Messianic character of the passage.

<sup>4</sup> **The Lord.** The Lord in the phrase "lest at any time the Lord be angry" is by some understood to indicate Jehovah, by others the anointed king. The former opinion is principally based on the Septuagint version, in which the definite subject is explicitly expressed; the latter opinion rests on the Hebrew text, in which no subject-noun is expressed, and therefore the one of the preceding phrase is naturally supplied. The Hebrew reads thus: "kiss ye the son, lest he be angry."

<sup>5</sup> **From the way.** Instead of the next phrase "and you perish from the just way," the Hebrew text reads "and you perish from the way." Cappell and Venema explain this to mean "suddenly;" for a man who perishes on the way perishes suddenly (cf. Ex. xxxiii. 3). Aben Ezra, Schröder, and Storr explain it as meaning "perish as to the way," i.e., "lest your way perish." Eichhorn interprets the "way" as equivalent to "life," and translates accordingly. The Septuagint, followed by the Vulgate, translates "and you perish from the just way" or the way of rectitude, i.e., the way that leads to the anointed king. Some scholars prefer the interpretation, "lest you perish on the way," i.e., during the progress of your rebellion, before you have attained your end.

<sup>6</sup> **When his wrath.** Some interpreters connect the last two verses,

## COROLLARY: THE MESSIAS IS THE SON OF GOD.

**1. IN THE LIGHT OF CHRISTIAN REVELATION.**—It has been shown in the explanation of the third stanza that the anointed king is the son of God (Heb. i. 5; v. 5; Acts xiii. 32, 33; iv. 25, 26; cf. Kilber, *Analysis Bibl.* ii. p. 8, notes); we have also seen that the psalm is Messianic, i.e., that the anointed king is identical with the promised Messiah. The inference that the Messiah is the son of God is therefore unavoidable. Those who contend that this sonship may be one by adoption, not by generation, must be referred to the text of the psalm itself. For though the title "son of God" is throughout the Old Testament not unfrequently given to the earthly leaders of the theocracy, the friends and servants of God, still the phrase "I have begotten thee," as even De Wette confesses, nowhere indicates merely adoptive sonship when God himself employs it. Besides, in Ps. xlv. (xlv.) 7 and cix. (cx.) 5 the same person is called Lord and God, and in the last but one verse of Ps. ii. he is named "Son." Consequently, we must again infer that the anointed king's sonship surpasses a merely adoptive one. Finally, according to the present Hebrew text, we must read: "Kiss the son, lest he become angry . . .," so that our trust must be placed in the son. But we can trust in Jehovah alone according to Ps. cxvii. (cxviii.) 9; cxlv. (cxlvi.) 3; Mich. vii. 5.

**2. IN THE LIGHT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.**—But lest we should seem to explain the prophecy of Ps. ii. entirely in

"when his wrath shall be kindled," etc., with what precedes by the conjunction "for" or "because;" others prefer to take them absolutely. The Hebrew word which is rendered in our versions "in a short time" is sometimes referred to quantity, thus: "when his wrath shall be kindled (even) a little." As to the meaning of the Hebrew word we may compare Prov. x. 20. The primary meaning of the expression rendered "trust" seems to be "to get under the folds of the garments of a person in power." To extend one's garments to a person is among the Arabs a sign of protection and security. Venerable Bede remarks that those trust in God who have the consciousness of having deserved the divine favor.

the light of the New Testament and of Christian Theology, we must consider in what light the Messiah was regarded even in the Synagogue. We have already seen that both Jarchi and Kimchi testify to the traditional Messianic interpretation of Ps. ii.; we might consequently infer *a priori* that the ancient Synagogue must have expected a Messiah who would be in a special way the Son of God. This inference we shall see amply confirmed by unsuspected testimony. For we shall investigate in the first place on what grounds Jarchi and Kimchi have asserted the existence of a Jewish tradition for the Messianic character of Ps. ii.; in the second place we shall give a few testimonies to show what manner of Divine sonship was attributed to the Messiah by the learned writers of the Synagogue; finally will be given the Jewish exegesis of a few prophecies that the Synagogue considered as nearly related to Psalm ii.

**I. Rabbinic Testimony for the Messianic Character of Ps. II.**—*a.* The psalm will be verified in the time of Gog and Magog. In *Mechilta* (fol. 3, 3) we read: "In future times, too, Gog and Magog shall fall down before Israel; David shall see it and exclaim, 'Why have the Gentiles raged?'" The Talmud (*Abodah zarah*, fol. 3, *b*), treating of the Messianic times, has the following: "When the war of Gog and Magog begins, they will say to them: 'Against whom have you gone forth?' They answer: 'Against the Lord and against his Christ.'" Finally, *Midrash Esther* (fol. 107, 4; cf. *Tanchuma*, fol. 55, 2; *Vayikra Rabba*, sect. 27 fin.) confirms the same statement: "Rabbi Levi has said: Gog and Magog too will say in the times of the Messiah: Those who have done anything against Israel before us have acted foolishly, for they (the Israelites) have a patron in heaven. We shall not act in the same way, but we shall first attack the patron, and afterwards the Israelites. The kings of the earth stood up, and the princes met together against the Lord and against his Christ. Then God will say to them: You wicked men,

will you attack me? How many armies, how many thunderbolts, and how many Seraphim and angels do I not possess? My power shall come forth and strive against you." Jewish exegesis has, therefore, identified the war of Gog and Magog against Israel with the rebellion described in Ps. ii. But the same war will take place in the times of the Messiah, as is clearly understood from the second and third of the above testimonies. Compare also Ezech. xxxviii. 2 and xxxix.

*b.* Again, the Jewish tradition holds that to the anointed king of Ps. ii. all power will be given, and all homage due. The Zohar (Dent. fol. 109, col. 436) comments on the phrase "kiss the son" (rendered in our versions "embrace discipline"). "Kiss ye the hands of the son, for God has given him power over all, so that all must serve him. For he is crowned with justice and mercy. He who deserves justice shall come to judgment; whosoever is worthy of mercy shall obtain mercy. Whosoever is not willing to praise this son, his sins shall be brought forth before the holy king, and before the heavenly mother." If we compare this description of the anointed king with the description of the Messiah given in the manifestly Messianic passages of Isaiah (ix. 6 f.; xi. 2 f.), we see again that Jewish exegesis has identified the anointed king of Ps. ii. with the Messiah.

*c.* But we go a step farther; the earliest Jewish commentaries expressly stated the identity of the Messiah with the hero of Ps. ii. We read in the Zohar (Gen. fol. 77, col. 293): "Beginning at that very time King Messiah will rise up, and then all Gentiles will be gathered to battle against Jerusalem," as David says: "The kings of the earth stood up." The same work has the following passage (Ex. fol. 24, col. 96): "The holy and all-blessed God puts on power against the Gentiles, who rise up against him, as is written: and the princes met together against the Lord and against his Christ, and this shall happen in the time of King Messiah." Bereshith Rabba (sect. 44, fol.

42, 4; *Mechilta* and *Seder 'Olam* in *Yalkut Simeoni* II. fol. 27, 4) says: "God has said to three persons: 'Ask of me;' to Solomon, to Achaz, and to the Messiah." The Talmud is not less explicit in the Messianic interpretation of Ps. ii. The treatise *Succah* (fol. 52, 1) says: "Our Rabbis teach: the holy God, blessed be he, says to the Messiah, the son of David: Ask of me." The Midrash *Tehillim* (ad Ps. cxx. 7, fol. 45, 4) gives a commentary on Ps. ii. 9: "The holy God, blessed be he, says to the Messiah: Thou shalt rule them with a rod of iron." The same Midrash in its commentary on Ps. ii. 7 has the following passage: "Preaching his commandment—this has been preached long ago in the Law, in the Prophets, and in the doctrinal books: In the Law, Ex. iv. 22: Israel is my son, my first-born; in the Prophets, Is. lii. 13: Behold, my servant shall understand; and xlii. 1 refers to the same: Behold my servant, I will uphold him; in the doctrinal books, Ps. ex. 1, The Lord said to my Lord; and Ps. ii. 7: The Lord hath said to me, thou art my son; and again Dan. vii. 23; and lo . . . with the clouds of heaven." The Jewish teaching concerning the Messianic reference of Ps. ii. is therefore certain beyond all doubt.

**B. The Divine Sonship of the Messiah as taught in the Synagogue.**—*a.* The anointed king is represented as the son of a king. *Mechilta* (*Yalkut Simeoni* II. fol. 53, 3), when commenting on the words "against the Lord and against his Christ," has the parable of a robber who stands defiantly behind a royal castle and holds the following monologue: "If I seize the king's son, I shall kill him and crucify him, that he may die a painful death;" but the holy Spirit derides him, as is written: "He that dwelleth in heaven shall laugh at them."

*b.* Again, the Messiah is represented as having no father. *Bereshith Rabba* (cf. Raym. Martini, part iii., dist. iii. 8, 5, et Hier. de S. Fide i. 5) has the following passage: "Rabbi Barachias speaks thus: God says to the Israelites: You tell me (*Lam. v. 3*) we are become orphans without a

father. Neither has the 'Goel' a father, whom I shall raise up unto you; according to Zacharias vi. 12: Behold a man, the Orient (Zemach) is his name, and under him shall he spring up. And Is. liii. 2 says: and he shall grow up as a tender plant before him. Of the same [person] David says in Ps. cix. (cx.) 3: from the mother of the dawn the dew of thy youth has come unto thee [for the different translations of this passage see the commentary on Ps. cix. (cx.)]; and in Ps. ii. 7: The Lord hath said to me: thou art my son."

c. In the third place, the Messiah is *declared* to be God's Son. Midrash Tehillim commenting on the words, "thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee," has the following passage: "When the time of the Messiah shall come, then the holy God, praised be his name, shall say to him: It is my duty to make a new covenant with him. For he says, To-day have I begotten thee. Then is his hour, when he shall be declared as his son."

d. Finally, the Messiah is openly *represented as the Son of God*. Zohar (Gen. fol. 88, col. 348) plainly expresses this: "This is the faithful shepherd. Of thee it is said, 'kiss the son;' thou art the prince of the Israelites, the Lord of the earth, the Lord of the ministering angels, the son of the Most High, the son of the holy God, blessed be he, and the gracious Shekhinah." Consequently, we may safely maintain that the Synagogue understood Ps. ii. not only of the Messiah, but also of a Messiah who would be the Son of God.

e. To give this last assertion a still more solid foundation, we shall next consider several passages of ancient Rabbinic writers containing the same doctrine, though they are not connected with Ps. ii. Some of these passages reveal this truth implicitly and obscurely; others state it clearly and unmistakably. The former may be reduced to the places in which the Messiah is called "the Middle Column," "the lower Adam," "the plant from below and above;" the latter



is found in those authors who call the Messiah the first-born, the Son of God.

1. IMPLICIT TESTIMONY.—*a. The Messiah is the Middle Column.*—Tikkune Zohar (c. 24, fol. 68, 2) tells us: "It is said of the Middle Column: Israel is my son, my first-born" (Ex. iv. 22). Here it suffices to recall what is written concerning the Middle Column in the Zohar (Numb. fol. 91, col. 364): "The Middle Column is the Metatron who, being beauty and comeliness, establishes peace with God in the highest: his name is like the name of his Lord, being made after his image and likeness; he comprises within himself all qualities from above downward, and from below upward (i.e., the divine and the human nature), and he unites everything in the middle." We must only add that Metatron is the name of the great Presence-angel, who guarded Israel in the Old Testament, and who is identical with the Messiah (cf. I. Myer, *Qabbalah*, pp. 365 f.).

*b. The Messiah is the Terrestrial Adam.*—Prov. xxx. 4 reads: "Who hath ascended up into heaven, and descendeth? who hath held the wind in his hands? who hath bound up the waters together as in a garment? who hath raised up all the borders of the earth? what is his name, and what is the name of his son, if thou knowest?" Referring to this verse the Zohar (Gen. fol. 39, col. 154; Tikkune Zohar c. 69, fol. 108, 2) says: "What is his name? The upper or celestial Adam. What is the name of his son? The lower or terrestrial Adam." Again in Zohar (Dent. fol. 119, col. 473) we read: "The words 'what is the name of his son?' refer to the faithful shepherd, i.e., to the Messiah." Consequently, the Messiah, the terrestrial Adam, is the son of the celestial Adam. It follows from these passages, at least, that the Messiah was expected to have a celestial origin.

*c. The Messiah is the Plant from Below and Above.*—Bereshith Rabba (sect. 90, fol. 91, 3, part iii. dist. i. 10, 12), interpreting Cant. viii. 12, "my vineyard is before me," says: "This is King Messiah, as Ps. lxxx. 16 has it: And

perfect the same which thy right hand hath planted. There is a twofold plantation (a celestial and a terrestrial). The lower one is Abraham, but the joint upper and lower one is the Messiah, according to Mich. ii. 13: 'He shall go up that shall open the way before them.' " Here too the twofold nature of the Messiah is obscurely indicated.

II. EXPLICIT TESTIMONY.—*a. The Messiah is the First-Born.*—Turning now to clearer passages, we may in the first place return to Ex. iv. 22: "Israel, my first-born" are words applied to the Messiah, not only by Jewish writers, but also by St. Matthew. We read in Myer (Qabbalah, pp. 261 f.): "From its union with Kether, out of which it is emanated, and to which it returns, proceeds Chokhmah, i.e., Wisdom, the Word or Son, the Logos, called the First-born . . ." And again (ibid.): "It (Wisdom) is also called by the Qabbalah 'the only begotten Son,' 'the First-born of Elohim,' etc."

What is important here is the identity of Chokhmah or Wisdom (Logos, Word) with the Messiah, as St. John has established it. Again, Tikkune Zohar (c. 14, pr.) has the following passage: "Come and see. Of Wisdom it is written, Ex. xiii. 2: Sanctify unto me every first-born. For every first-born is called after her (Wisdom's) name. Hence the Shekhinah too is named the First-born. Of Wisdom it is clearly said in Ezech. xlv. 30: The first-fruits (literally, the beginning) of all the first-born. His first-born son is the first of all, and the Middle Column." Now we have already seen that the Messiah was called both "Middle Column" and "Shekhinah." Consequently "the first-born" was one of the Messianic titles.

*b. The Messiah is the Son of God.*—Shemoth Rabba (sect. c. 35, fol. 133, 2) reads: "We find that in future times all nations, but Egypt first of all, shall offer gifts to King Messiah. And lest anyone should think that God would not accept the gift from them, the holy God, blessed be he, says to the Messiah: Accept them from them. From that time gifts have been offered to my son in Egypt,

as is written, Ps. lxvii. (lxviii.) 32: Ambassadors shall come out of Egypt." The Talmud repeats this passage, substituting "to my sons" instead of "to my son," so as not to favor the Christian teaching that the Messiah is the Son of God. What has been said establishes the traditional teaching of the Synagogue concerning the divine sonship of the Messiah beyond all reasonable doubt; for a still fuller statement of the same see the section on the Divinity of the Messiah.

## CHAPTER II.

THE MESSIAS IS THE SEED OF THE WOMAN. GEN. III. 1-19.

## INTRODUCTION.

**1. MYTHICAL EXPLANATION.**—The Mosaic history of our first parents' fall cannot be regarded as a mere myth, concerning the condition of primitive man, similar to the myths existing in other nations. This view, whether it represents the Mosaic account as a mere philosophic theory concerning the origin of evil (Rosenmüller), or as the figurative expression of sensual allurements (Reuss, etc.), is in either case equally untenable. Not as if we denied the similarity between the heathen myths and the Hebrew account concerning the primeval condition of mankind; but we maintain that this very similarity is more satisfactorily explained if the historic character of Moses' story be admitted than if it be denied. For if all is mere myth, why have all the nations of antiquity developed mythologies which are identical rather than similar? And if it be said that the critical analysis of the Pentateuch suggests the mythical character of the Mosaic story, we point to the fact that this is incompatible with the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch.

**2. SYMBOLICAL EXPLANATION.**—Still, this latter argument does not weaken the theory proposed by Philo, though it destroys Reuss' position on the present question. Philo (cf. *De mundi opificio*, p. 26, c., ed. Francofordiæ, M.DC. XXIX.) believes that the serpent mentioned in the third chapter of Genesis is a symbol of sensual pleasure. The state of paradise applies only to the time when Adam was

alone on earth; having given way to their desire of offspring, Adam and Eve had naturally to bear all the consequences: Eve had to suffer the pangs of childbirth, Adam was subjected to the annoying cares of his household. Both were thus condemned to a severe punishment for yielding to their wanton desire. The serpent is said to be doomed to eat the dust of the earth, because man's pleasure is of a low kind, connected with the world of sense and matter. According to this view, there are only five historical facts contained in the first chapters of Genesis: 1. The existence of God; 2. God's unity; 3. God's creation of the world; 4. the unity of this world; 5. God's ruling providence over this world. Everything besides these five points is myth and symbol, serving merely as the outward garb of the hidden truth.

**3. ALLEGORICAL EXPLANATION.**—The view of Cajetan regarding the third chapter of Genesis bears some resemblance to the theory of Philo, though it differs widely enough from its Jewish prototype to avoid all theological censure. What is called the serpent in Genesis is, according to Card. Cajetan, nothing but the devil tempting Eve inwardly; what is described as a dialogue between the serpent and Eve is a mere series of suggestions which the devil made in Eve's heart. The temptation therefore and the fall really occurred, but the manner in which they are told is a mere allegory. A number of Protestant authors, who reject Reuss' theory according to which Gen. iii. is a mythical representation of the origin of sin in general, still adhere to a modified form of Cajetan's view. Gen. iii. is a myth indeed, or an allegory, which does not concern the origin of sin in general, but our first parents' sin in particular. Some of these writers admit the presence and the agency of the devil in Eve's temptations, others speak only of the allurements of sensual pleasure. Abarbanel's explanation, which admits the presence of a real serpent, but denies the agency of the devil, whose conversation is supplied by the thoughts arising in Eve's mind when she

saw the serpent eating of the forbidden fruit, has found so little favor that it is practically extinct. It will appear in the commentary that the mythical and allegorical explanations of the passage are incompatible with the context and the universal national traditions concerning the history of our first parents.

**4. MESSIANIC CHARACTER OF THE PASSAGE.**—This is proved by way of corollary at the end of this chapter.

### GEN. III. 1-19.

<sup>1</sup> Now the serpent was more subtle than any of the beasts of

<sup>1</sup> For the sake of clearness we shall first consider the temptation of our first parents; secondly, their sin; and finally, the consequences of their sin. In the first part we must again treat separately of the tempter and of the persons tempted.

**1. The Temptation and Sin.**—*a. THE TEMPTER.*—To do justice to this part, we must inquire into the external appearance of the tempter, his personality, and the way and manner of the temptation.

*A. The External Appearance of the Tempter.*—There is no adequate reason for abandoning the literal meaning of Genesis regarding the external appearance of the tempter. The whole section necessarily implies a supernatural dealing of God with man, so that no figurative meaning can explain away the miraculous. Besides, the literal meaning once disregarded, we have no sufficient guide in selecting the figurative.

The word *nachash* used in the Hebrew text seems to be cognate to a verb meaning "to view," "to observe attentively," "to divine;" the corresponding noun signifies in one form "brass," "fetters;" in another "divination," "augury;" and in the form found in the present passage it denotes "a serpent" (cf. Ex. iv. 3; vii. 15; Numb. xxi. 6, 7, 9; Dent. viii. 15, etc.). The Fathers agree on this, as may be seen in Reinke, A. T. t. ii. 269.

The fanciful meaning "ape," given to "*nachash*" in Clarke's commentary, is both unsatisfactory and groundless. Even if we adopt the common meaning "serpent," our question remains a difficult one. More than forty species of serpents are enumerated by systematic nomenclators and travellers as occurring in northern Africa, Arabia, and Syria. A definite answer cannot be given to the question, What kind of serpent is intended in the sacred text? Engubinus believes that a basilisk is meant; Pererius speaks of the scytalis, noted for its variegated and beautiful colors; Delrio connects the present passage with St. Luke iii., and interprets "*nachash*" as viper.

The statement of Genesis, "the serpent was more subtle than any of the beasts of the earth," no more determines a definite species of serpent than it proves Clarke's interpretation, which we have stated above. Whether this superior cunning of the serpent be real or only



the earth which the Lord God had made. And he said to the

analogical, it is well known in Scriptural language. Ps. lvii. (lviii.) 5 says: "their madness is according to the likeness of a serpent: like the deaf asp that stoppeth her ears" in order not to hear the sound of the enchanter. Gen. xlix. 17 knows of "a serpent in the path, that biteth the horse's heel that the rider may fall backward." Jesus himself warns his apostles to be "wise as serpents" (Matthew x. 16). This opinion regarding the serpent's cunning probably has its foundation in the noiseless, sneaking manner in which it ensnares its prey, and in the powerful instinct of self-preservation through which it avoids any fatal blow on its head, its principal seat of life.

We find the snake graphically represented in ancient inscriptions, and especially on Babylonian and Assyrian cylinders. It is certain beyond doubt that such representations were religious symbols; but their precise signification still remains a mystery. On one representation in particular (G. Smith, *Chald. Gen.* p. 85, f. 301, 305; *Del. PD.* 90) we see a man and a woman sitting on two chairs on either side of a date-tree, both stretching out their hands towards the fruit; behind the woman's chair a serpent is coiled up, the head of which is reared up above the woman's head. Though we cannot assert that the history of our first parents' temptation and sin has been pictured on this cylinder, still we may draw the reader's attention to the close resemblance between this representation and the story of Genesis (cf. Schrader, *K. A. T.* 37 f.). In the light of Gen. iii. 1-15, taken in its literal sense, we can readily understand why the serpent figures in the history, the creeds, and the legends of nearly all ancient nations, while the mythical or allegorical explanation of the same passage leaves the agreement of mythology a mystery. The nations of the North told of Jormund's Gander, or Kater, the serpent of the deep. In Hindu lore there exist innumerable fables of Nagas and Naga-kings. The serpent entwined around a staff was, among the Romans, the symbol of health and the distinctive mark of the God Æsculapius. We might perhaps compare the brazen serpent raised up in the wilderness (*Numb.* xxi. 4-9) with the above symbol of Æsculapius and Hygeia, did we not know that the serpent's longevity was proverbial, so much so that the representation of the common house-snake, biting its tail, was typical of eternity. This is not the place to say much of the old dragon-temples, which are found from the highest parts of Asia and Colchis to the north of Great Britain and to the middle States of our own continent; the structures have avenues of upright stones, several miles in length, and are connected with circles representing the mundane egg. In Egypt the serpent-worship had struck such deep root that even a Christian sect of Ophitæ, or Ophiani, arose as late as the second century of our era. Compare Tertullian, *de præscrip.* c. 47; Epiphan. *hæres.* 37. Without insisting on the absolute certainty of a connection existing between all these religious rites offered to the serpent tribe and the serpent's influence on the early destiny of mankind as told in Genesis, we only draw attention to the natural and easy explanation of the universal religious awe and reverence paid to this particular species of the animal kingdom, if we admit the story of Genesis in its literal meaning.

<sup>2</sup> woman: <sup>3</sup> "Why hath God commanded you, that you should not

B. *The Person of the Tempter.*—In the second place, a few words must be said about the personality of the tempter in paradise. Both sacred Scripture and tradition agree in assigning the devil as the tempter of Eve. In Matthew xii. 29; John viii. 44; Acts x. 38, Satan is in general terms represented as the enemy of man; in John xii. 31; 11. Cor. x. 4; Eph. vi. 12; 11. Thess. ii. 9; Apoc. xii. 9; xx. 2, Satan is the enemy of God and of his Christ, the prince of the reign of darkness, which he endeavors to establish by means of his own secret actions, by the instrumentality of his ministers, i.e., bad Christians, and of Antichrist; finally, in Apoc. xii. 9, it is expressly stated: "and that great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, who is called the devil and Satan, who seduceth the whole world." In the light of this fact we understand why Jesus, the second Adam, was tempted by the devil in the beginning of his career as our Redeemer; as our fall had begun with the devil's victory over the first Adam, so our redemption must begin with the devil's defeat by the second Adam.

But even the Old Testament identified the tempter in paradise with Satan. In Eccus. xxv. 33 we read: "From the woman came the beginning of sin, and through her we all die. . . ." We notice that here "the beginning of sin" and "we all die" are parallel terms; consequently, we all die by reason of sin, brought into the world by the tempter in paradise. "But by the envy of the devil death came into the world" (Wis. ii. 24). Hence the tempter in paradise and the devil must be identified. The causal nexus between sin and death, which in Eccus. xxv. 33 is inferred from the parallelism of terms, is clearly stated by St. Paul (Rom. v. 12): "As by one man sin entered into the world, and by sin death. . . ."

For the existence of Christian tradition in favor of the identity of the tempter with Satan, we must refer to Clement of Alexandria (Cohort. ad gent. i. 6); Origen (de princip. iii. 2); Iren. (Hær. iv. 10); Tertull. (de spectac. 18); Athan. (ad episc. Egypt., p. 108); Epiphan. (Hær. i. 40); Chrysost. (Hom. 16 in Gen. ii.); Theodoret (Quest. 35); August. (de Gen. ad lit. 11); Damasc. (de fide orthod. ii. 10).

We may even point to legendary traditions existing among the Persians and Indians, in which the serpent is identified with or represented as the tool of the devil. The Vedas describe the war of nature as waged in the storm by the god Indra, armed with lightning and thunder, against a serpent *Ali*, who has carried off the dawns or the rivers, described as goddesses or as milch cows, and who keeps them captive in the folds of the clouds. In the Avesta this war is a struggle for the possession of the light of *hvarenô*, between *Atar*, described as either the weapon or the son of *Ahura*, and *Azi Dahâka*, "the fiendish snake," a three-headed dragon, who strives to seize and put out the *hvarenô*. Compare Yt. xix. 47-52; Sacred Books of the East, vol. iv, pp. lxii. f. In order to understand the connection of this struggle with the history of primitive man, we must keep in mind that, in the Veda, *Yama*, the son of *Vivasvat*, is the first man. The corresponding figure in the Avesta is *Yima*, the son of *Vivanghant*, though the characteristic of being the first man

eat of every tree of paradise?" And the woman answered him, has been transferred to Gayô Maratan. But Gayô Maratan, Yima, the bird Karsiptan are, under different names, forms, and functions, identical with Zarathustra, i. e., the god-like champion in the struggle for light. Now Yima possesses the hvarenô, i. e., the light of sovereignty, the glory from above which makes the king an earthly god. Sovereignty and servitude are united with its possession and its loss respectively. When Yima "began to find delight in words of falsehood and untruth, the Glory (hvarenô) was seen to flee away from him" (Yt xix 32) and Azi Dahâka reigned. (Sacred Books of the East, iv pp lxiii., lxxv., lxxviii; cf. Delitzsch, *Neuer Commentar*, Leipz 1887, p 99).

Regarding the exception of some authors that the Hebrews had no knowledge of a personal Satan before the time of the Babylonian captivity, we may refer to the various explanations found in Corluy (*Spicileg Dogm.*, vol i. p. 356). Supposing that the above assertion be true, it does not follow that God could not afterwards reveal the true nature of the tempter, as he has actually done. The inspired writer of Gen iii 1-15 may have written his story as he had seen it in vision, or as the popular version of tradition delivered it unto him, or as the painter and the sculptor were wont to represent it, without the explicit thought that the real tempter was a hidden agent. Besides, it is false that the Hebrews knew of no personal Satan before the Babylonian captivity. In Dent xxxii. 17 we are told "They sacrificed to devils, and not to God, to gods whom they knew not." In Lev. xvi. 8 we read according to the Hebrew text: "and casting lots upon them both, one lot unto the Lord, and one lot unto Azâzël." Now, according to the more probable interpretation of the word, Azâzël signifies Satan (Spencer, *leg. rit.*, l. iii. diss. viii. c. 1, 2; Gesenius, *Lexic Hebraic.*; Rosenmüller; Winer, *Lexic.*; Origen, Corluy, Crélier, etc.); not as if one goat had been sacrificed to the Lord, and the other to Satan, but the sending forth of the scape-goat was a symbolical action, signifying that the kingdom of Satan was renounced, and that the sins to which he had tempted individuals or the nation were sent back to him. Later on, Satan again appears in the book of Job i., ii. and in I. Par. xxi. 1; Zach. iii. 1 represents him as an enemy of God and founder of a kingdom of evil. The suggestion that in the book of Job a good angel may be spoken of (Herder, Eichhorn, Ilgen, Jahn, Baumgarten-Crusius) is hardly worth noticing; if the Hebrews knew at that time of the existence of good angels, why should the existence of bad angels be concealed from them? In the same manner we may argue from Gen. xvi. 7; xix. 1; Ex. xxxii. 34, Numb. xxii. 22, where a knowledge of the existence of good angels is either asserted or implied. Finally, to carry the war into the enemies' camp, the Hebrews could not have obtained their idea of Satan in the Babylonian captivity. For according to Sacred Scripture the evil one is under the absolute power of God, and can do no harm to any creature except by God's permission. But Ahriman, the Persian principle of evil, has an absolute existence, lives in constant, open war with Ormuzd, the good principle, inflicts repeatedly serious injuries on him, and will be overcome only at the end of time.

saying: "Of the fruit of the trees that <sup>4</sup>are in paradise we do

*C. The Manner of the Temptation.*—After determining the personality of the tempter and his outward appearance, we must finally inquire into the manner in which the temptation was carried out. There are a number of authors who maintain that what Eve saw when she was tempted was no real serpent, but only the appearance of a serpent, assumed for the time by the devil (Cyril, l. iii. c. Julian; Eugubini, in *Cosmopœia*). The majority of commentators who adhere to the literal meaning of Gen. iii. 1-15 at all admit the presence of a real serpent, of which Satan had taken possession (cf. Mariana).

But why did the devil employ such a low and ignoble instrument for his purpose? The appearance of a man or the semblance of fire or of a cloud would have suited his purpose much better. Cr  lier sees in this fact a special disposition of God's goodness, who wishing to try man's obedience, did it in such a manner as to make man naturally despise and shrink from the tempter. Compare Augustine, Gen. ad lit. xi. 29; St. Thom. Summa Theol. II<sup>a</sup> ii<sup>ae</sup> q. 165, a. 2, ad 4.

Others, however, believe that before the fall man admired and loved the serpent more than any other animal. Bauer (Theol. A. T. p. 189) believes that even the Seraphim were a kind of basilisk-headed Cherubim, or that they were animal forms with serpents' heads, such as we find in the temples of ancient Thebes (Gesen. Comment. in Is.). Hitzig and others identify the Seraphim with the Egyptian Serapis, whose worship was a modification of the more ancient worship of Kneph; the latter was represented under the form of a serpent, the head of which afterwards formed the crest of Serapis. All this seems to be based on the fact that a species of serpent was called Saraph, which is the singular number of the word Seraphim. The primeval excellence of the serpent is much better accounted for by Loch and Reischl. As Lucifer had been one of the most exalted angels before his fall, so he made use, in tempting Eve, of the most beautiful and exalted animal; after God's curse the serpent became the basest and most dreaded of the animal world, as the devil himself had through his pride become the outcast of the spirit world. The above authors ascribe the same opinion to St. Ambrose.

Another question usually asked in connection with this subject concerns the speech attributed to the serpent. 1. Julian the Apostate asks sneeringly in what language the serpent had spoken; Clarke infers from this incident that the animal cannot have been a serpent, but must have been an ape, as if an ape could speak without the miraculous influence of God's power. 2. Josephus (Antiqu. l. i. c. 1), Basil (Hom. de paradiso), Ephrem (Barcepha de parad. c. 17), and others hold that before the fall all animals had the faculty of speech. 3. Mariam follows the opinion of St. Clement of Alexandria (Strom. i.) and St. Augustine (II. de doctrin. Christ.) that all animals have a kind of language by means of which they communicate their feelings and impressions to one another, and that our first parents before the fall understood this animal language. 4. Menochius, Gordon, and others maintain that the devil produced the words in the serpent's mouth by moving its tongue in the required manner; but this was no

eat ; but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of paradise

vital act of the serpent, since it proceeded from no really intrinsic principle (Chrysost., Procop., August 1. xiv (iv. 11). 5. Others contend that the devil produced the vocal sounds in the ears of Eve in such a manner that Eve referred them to the serpent's mouth. We hardly need to state Cajetan's opinion, who reduces the serpent's language to an interior suggestion, but eliminates also the real serpent. Abarbanel's view and that of his Rabbinic followers, according to which the real serpent is admitted but the devil is eliminated, and the temptation reduced to mere bad example, does not deserve any more attention. The explanations given under 4 and 5 sufficiently account for the serpent's speech.

<sup>2</sup> b. THE PERSONS TEMPTED.—Having thus far explained what refers to the tempter in the story of man's fall, his external appearance, his personality, and the means he employed, we must now proceed to consider the person tempted. Adam's superior intelligence and the wealth of his infused knowledge rendered his deception by the devil very difficult. But the love he had for his divinely appointed companion well-nigh equalled the greatness of his knowledge. The devil, having been permitted to try Adam's obedience, used even then his peculiar tactics of assaulting his victims from their weakest side. Unable to lead Adam into sin by deceiving his judgment, free from passion as he was, he brought about his fall by making use of Adam's pure love for Eve. Had Eve once tasted the forbidden fruit, holding as she did in Adam's heart a place second to God alone, Adam must be strong indeed to resist her powerful pleading. Hence it is that we read in the sacred text : " And he [the serpent] said to the woman."

But why did not her very wonder at the serpent's miraculous speech put Eve on her guard? Various answers have been given by different commentators : 1. The two opinions that before the fall all animals had the power of speech, and that before the fall man understood the animal language, which even now exists, have been stated in the preceding paragraph. Either would explain the absence of Eve's surprise, if one should adopt it. 2. Procopius, Cyril (1. iii. c. Jul.), Abulensis, Pererius, Estius, and others maintain that Eve had not yet learned the restriction of the faculty of speech to man. Her infused knowledge was, according to these authors, much more limited than that given to Adam. 3. A Lapide, St. Thomas (p. i. q. 94, a. 4), Bonaventure, and others believe that Eve was aware of the miraculous character of the serpent's speech, but she attributed it to a spirit, without reflecting whether it was a good or a bad spirit. Being as yet in the state of her original justice, she had nothing to fear in either case. 4. The Master of Sentences (1. ii. dist. xvii. 2) is of opinion that Eve believed in God's immediate influence in the serpent's speech. The second and third opinions appear to be the more probable ones, and if we must choose either of the two, we prefer the second to the third.

Having thus far investigated why Eve rather than Adam was tempted by the serpent, and why she did not shrink back in horror at the first approach of her uncanny interlocutor, we must in the next place watch step by step the tempter's progress. From the



God hath commanded us that we should not eat, and that we should not touch it, lest perhaps we die." <sup>6</sup> And the serpent said

Hebrew text it appears that the sacred writer has not left us the whole dialogue between Eve and the serpent. The inspired narrative opens where the conversation begins to reach the crisis.

<sup>3</sup> The Hebrew conjunction with which the serpent's question is introduced is found nowhere else at the beginning of a conversation or a paragraph. We may render it as expressive of doubtful surprise. "Is it true that God hath commanded you . . . ?" By this insidious query, which was apt to excite, according to the disposition of the listener, either indignation at God's hardness or doubt concerning the real meaning of God's command, the devil sounded Eve's heart to its innermost recesses.

<sup>4</sup> The woman's answer in its first part is the best that could be desired; but the last phrases, "that we should not touch it" and "lest perhaps we die," have justly provoked criticism. As Cr  lier observes, Eve exaggerates the precept and minimizes the punishment. God had forbidden only the eating of the fruit, but Eve adds "that we should not touch it." God had said: "In what day soever thou shalt eat of it, thou shalt die the death" (Gen. ii. 17); Eve merely answers: "lest perhaps we die." It must, however, be stated that while many interpreters with St. Ambrose (*de parad.* l. xii.) and Rupertus (*l. iii. c. 5*) ascribe this exaggeration to an odium of God's command on the part of the woman, others (a Lap., Malvend., etc.) attribute the same to Eve's conscientiousness. Again the "perhaps" of the last phrase is not explicitly expressed in the Hebrew text, though even in it the rigor of the threatened punishment is considerably modified. St. Bernard (*Serm. xxii. n. 3 de divers.*) has well understood this. "God affirms," he says; "the woman doubts; the devil denies."

<sup>5</sup> Though we cannot fully understand the woman's disposition of heart from her answer, the serpent, no doubt, understood it; her tone of voice and external bearing determining for him what the dead letter leaves ambiguous for us. The devil continues to attack what he had found to be Eve's weakest point. 1. "You shall not die the death." 2. "God doth know that in what day soever you shall eat thereof your eyes shall be opened." 3. "You shall be as gods." 4. "You shall know good and evil." The devil first emphatically denies that any evil is connected with the eating of the forbidden fruit, thus removing the fear of punishment. Then he promises precisely those goods which the woman most desired, having them most admired in God himself: speculative knowledge ("your eyes shall be opened"), and practical knowledge ("knowing good and evil"), but both independently of God ("you shall be as gods"). The connecting words "for God doth know" are explained by some as a proof that the command regarding the fruit was not meant seriously or contained a mystery not yet understood by our first parents (*August., l. ii. de Gen. ad lit. c. 30; a Lap.*), by others as an insinuation that God had given the command through envy and jealousy (*Mariana, Culmet, Cr  lier, etc.*). Either motive was sufficient to remove the second barrier that stood between the forbidden fruit and Eve, i.e., her love for God; how the fear of punishment



to the woman: "No, you shall not die the death. For God doth know that in what day soever you shall eat thereof, your eyes shall be opened, and you shall be as gods, knowing good and evil."

And <sup>6</sup> the woman saw that the tree was good to eat, and fair had been overcome has been stated above. We may notice in passing the fanciful interpretation which Abulensis (c. xiii. q. 492) gives of the clause "your eyes shall be opened." Both Adam and Eve were blind before the fall according to him, and only after their sin they began to see that they were naked. The phrase "as gods" is rendered "as angels" by several interpreters and Rabbinic writers, while the Chaldee version reads "as princes;" but the context and the majority of commentators favor the rendering "as gods," or "like unto God."

<sup>6</sup> Thus far all obstacles to the eating of the forbidden fruit had been removed, and a most powerful incentive for partaking of the same had been suggested. Now "the woman saw that the tree was good to eat, and fair to the eyes, and delightful to behold," or as the Hebrew text has the last clause, "a desirable [means] to become wise;" consequently even her sensuality is now affected. "And she took of the fruit . . . and did eat." Some interpreters believe that the forbidden fruit was that of the fig-tree; others speak of dates, but the more common opinion assigns the apple-tree as that on which God's prohibition rested (Estius). This opinion may be based on Cant. viii. 5: "Under the apple-tree I raised thee up; there thy mother was corrupted," and on the fact that the tree was "fair to the eyes." Though the matter of the divine precept was light, the precept itself was a grave and weighty one by reason of the motive for which it had been given. The fate of the whole human race had been by the will of God connected with its observance or violation, Adam representing in his obedience or disobedience all mankind.

Finally, a word about the temptation of Adam must be added, and we shall have brought our consideration of the temptation to a close. Instead of the phrase "and [she] gave her husband" the Hebrew text reads: "and she gave also her husband with her." Hence some writers infer that Adam was present at Eve's conversation with the serpent (Fag., Pisc., Oleast.); but it is more commonly believed that Adam was absent when Eve was tempted. The phrase "with her" is explained as indicating that Eve ate a second time of the forbidden fruit when she tempted Adam (Mariana), or that Adam met Eve while she was eating of the fruit (Menochius), or finally that Adam ate of the fruit as Eve had done (Malvenda). A Lapidé is of opinion that Adam was greatly impressed by the fact that Eve had eaten of the fruit and had not died. Next, the serpent's promises of divine knowledge, god-like wisdom, and independence of God produced their impression. Still, Adam was not deceived by all this, as Eve had been (see I. Tim. ii. 14). It was Adam's love for Eve that brought about his final resolution. The arguments coming from her lips have an additional strength; she must not be offended at any cost; God's command cannot be meant to be such a grave one

to the eyes, and delightful to behold ; and she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and <sup>7</sup> gave to her husband, who did eat.

after all, and God's love is of less importance than that of Eve. Compare Mariana, Calmet, Malvenda, a Lapide, Augustine (Civit. l. xiv. 11).

**2. The Twofold Sin.**—A. SIN OF EVE.—We must now briefly enumerate the various sins which, according to the opinions of commentators, Adam and Eve committed in eating of the forbidden fruit. St. Augustine (Gen. ad. lit. l. xi. c. 30 ; de lib. arbit. l. iii. c. 24 ; retract. l. i. c. 14 ; de Civit. Dei l. xiv. c. 11 et 13) is of opinion that Eve would not have believed the serpent, had not her mind been imbued with self-love and presumption. From this we must not infer what Rupertus maintains, that Eve had sinned even before the temptation by yielding to pride and a desire of the forbidden fruit. This sin of thought would then have been the occasion of the temptation. The same Rupertus, together with Hugo and the Master of Sentences, places Eve's first outward sin in the doubting expression "lest perhaps we die." St. Ambrose thinks that Eve committed her first sin by adding the clause "and that we should not touch it" to God's precept. Chrysostom sees the woman's first sin in her conversation with the serpent. But none of these opinions appear to be probable, since the first sin was an act of the will rather than of the intellect. Besides, it seems to be commonly admitted that such an error would not amount to a mortal sin ; but venial sin was, according to St. Thomas (1.<sup>a</sup> ii.<sup>ae</sup> q. 89, a. 3), not possible in the state of primitive innocence.

Though the whole sin of Eve may be said to be a sin of disobedience, because disobedience was its ultimate completion, still by analysis we may learn the different steps which led to the final rebellion.

1. The first sinful step was pride, which manifested itself in a desire of possessing divine wisdom and knowledge independently of God (Eccles. x. 14 ; Tob. iv. 14 ; St. Ambrose 4 in Luc. ; St. Ignat., epist. ad Trallianos ; St. Chrysost. in I. Tim. ii. 14 ; St. August., l. xi. de Gen. ad lit. c. 5 ; l. xvi. de civit. c. 13 ; St. Thom. 11.<sup>a</sup> ii.<sup>ae</sup> q. 163, 2, a Lap., etc.). 2. The second sinful step was indignation at God's command by means of which the sinfully desired good was kept from man. 3. Another step to ruin was Eve's curiosity. 4. This was followed by a desire of the forbidden food. 5. Then came a formal belief of the serpent's words and promises. 6. Lastly, the forbidden fruit was eaten through an act of formal disobedience.

<sup>1</sup> The question whether Eve in tempting Adam formally knew that she had been deceived has been variously answered. Calmet after St. Ambrose (l. de parad. c. 6) believes that Eve knew her mistake before she addressed Adam. But the more common opinion inclines to the opposite view. Adam, not Eve, had been constituted the moral head of the human race, on whose obedience or disobedience the gift of nature's integrity was to depend. Consequently, though Eve had lost sanctifying grace, yet before Adam's fall she might still possess the other gifts of the state of paradise (freedom from concupiscence, immortality, infused knowledge, etc.). How else could we explain that she appeared naked before Adam without sentiments of

And \* the eyes of them both were opened ; and when they per-shame ? Of her loss of sanctifying grace she was not conscious, so that her mistake was as yet unknown to her. Some authors speak also of a kind of enthusiasm for the forbidden fruit that had taken possession of Eve, so that she neglected the pangs of conscience, if any should have made themselves felt.

**B. SIN OF ADAM.**—The sin of Adam is represented by Pererius as containing eight steps : 1, pride ; 2, a too great desire to please his wife ; 3, curiosity ; 4, incredulity, as if God had not meant his command seriously ; 5, presumption as to the levity of sin ; 6, gluttony ; 7, disobedience ; 8, vain excuse of his sin. St. Augustine (serm. 19 de sanetis) says : “ Had not Adam excused himself, he would not have been exiled from paradise.” But Pererius, as a Lapidé has it, rightly holds the opposite opinion to be the true one, according to which Adam lost the state of his paradisiacal integrity by his disobedience.

The question whether Adam or Eve sinned more grievously is answered by St. Thomas (II.<sup>a</sup> ii.<sup>ae</sup> q. 163, a. 4) with a distinction : If the sin be viewed in itself, Eve’s transgression was the more grievous one, because she sinned first and induced Adam to follow her example ; if the person be considered, Adam’s sin was more grievous, because he had been constituted the moral head of mankind : he had received his command immediately from God, and his knowledge and prudence probably by far surpassed those of Eve.

\* **3. Consequences of the Sin.**—Having thus far considered the temptation and sin of our first parents, we must next investigate the consequences of their sin. They may be divided into three classes : A. such as followed immediately ; B. those that manifested themselves at the approach of God ; C. those revealed in God’s judgment.

**A. IMMEDIATE CONSEQUENCES.**—The immediate consequences are contained in the verse : a. “ and the eyes of them both were opened ; b. and when they perceived themselves to be naked ; c. they sewed together fig-leaves and made themselves aprons.” In general we notice here how clause by clause forms an ironical contrast with the serpent’s promises : an increase of knowledge they obtained, but instead of perceiving themselves to be as gods, they perceived themselves to be naked ; their desired increase of wisdom taught them how to sew together fig-leaves and make themselves aprons. The *Toheleth Joseph* tells us in its preface that the angel Raziel brought a book full of the greatest mysteries to Adam after his fall, but by the advice of the angel Adarniel Adam sealed the book and consulted it only concerning the highest mysteries, such as the form of God’s chariot throne, the foundations and movements of the heavens, the diverse languages of the universe, the good and bad angels, astronomy, the times and seasons, the influence of the stars, the manufacture of talismans, and all profane and sacred worship. Josephus too (*Antiqu.*, l. i. c. 1) believes that through an inherent virtue of the forbidden fruit Adam learned several things that had formerly been unknown to him, e.g., his own nakedness.

A Lapidé gives the following analysis of the peculiar knowledge gained by Adam and Eve after their fall : 1. They felt the sting of concupiscence. St. Augustine (de Gen. xi.) says that their eyes were

ceived themselves to be naked, they sewed together fig-leaves and made themselves aprons.

And when<sup>9</sup> they heard the voice of the Lord God walking in opened to lust after each other (Mariana, Sa, Malvend., Menoch., etc.). 2. Hence they became conscious of their nakedness, and were filled with shame and confusion (Gordon, Malvend.). 3. The eyes of their mind were opened, so that they understood the good they had lost and the evil they had brought on themselves. St. Chrysostom says (Hom. 16, in Gen.): "The eyes, not of their bodies, but of their minds were opened." St. Augustine too (de Civit. Dei, l. xiv. c. 17) believes that their eyes were opened, so as to know the good they had lost and the evil that had befallen them (Mariana, Sa, Malvend., Menoch., Tirin.). 4. They knew too that the serpent's premises had been false, that God's word was true (Menoch., Tirin.). How far our first parents' knowledge extended to the particulars of their misery,—whether they knew, e.g., that they had lost the possession of paradise, the infused virtues of charity and prudence,—we cannot determine (cf. a Lap., Tirin.).

This knowledge was naturally followed by what is told in the words of Sacred Scripture: "they sewed together fig-leaves and made themselves aprons." Iren. (l. iii. c. 37) is of opinion that Adam and Eve chose the fig-leaves for a covering of their nakedness in order to do penance by patiently bearing the stings of its thorns. Mariana holds that the fig-leaf was chosen because, according to the opinion of many Rabbinic and most Greek commentators, the fruit of the fig-tree had been the forbidden fruit. Malvenda and Menochius say that the fig-leaf was chosen by reason of its great size; some Indian fig-trees are said to have leaves as large as a shield (cf. Pliny, l. xii. c. v.; Solin. c. 45; Theophrast. l. iv. de plantis). The Hebrew word rendered "leaf" has, at times, the wider meaning "foliage" (cf. Jer. xvii. 8). Calmet interprets our passage according to this wider meaning, and thinks that the apron was a kind of wattled work made of green branches.

<sup>9</sup> B. PRELIMINARIES TO THE SENTENCE.—Next we must pass in review those consequences of our first parents' sin which manifested themselves at God's approach. The nature of this divine visitation was undoubtedly merciful. The rebellious angels had been cast headlong into eternal ruin, but sinful man was to have an opportunity of retracing his false step. The question whether in the state of paradisaical integrity any sin committed by Adam, not in his character of moral head of mankind, or by any descendant of Adam, would have been pardoned, has been touched by Gordon, and is answered by the dogmatic theologians. Gordon believes the question is insoluble with our present amount of natural and revealed truth. Returning, therefore, to our case as stated in Genesis, we are first informed concerning the time and circumstances of God's merciful visit, and then God's judicial inquest preliminary to his sentence is narrated.

*a. Time and Circumstances.*—The time and circumstances are contained in verse 8: 1. At the afternoon air; 2. when they heard the voice of the Lord God walking in paradise; 3. Adam and his wife hid themselves from the face of the Lord God, amidst the trees of paradise.

paradise at the afternoon air, Adam and his wife hid themselves

1. *General Determination of Time.*—The Hebrew text reads: “at (or in) the wind of the day” instead of the clause “at the afternoon air.” The Septuagint has the rendering “in the evening;” Theodotion interprets “at the air towards the cool of the day;” the Chaldee version reads “after the rest of the day,” i.e., as Calmet explains it, after the rest taken in warm climates during the hot mid-day hours. Certain Rabbinic writers hold that Adam had fallen at the tenth hour, i.e., about 4 P.M., according to our way of reckoning. Though some few interpreters believe that the sin happened during the course of the morning (cf. Malvend.), the more common opinion places it in the afternoon. The *Histor. Scholastica* assigns the seventh hour, i.e., about 1 P.M.; but Lucas Tudensis (Isidore, in *Chronicis*) says: “Adam was formed at the first hour of the day, led into paradise at the third hour, seduced at the sixth hour, and at the ninth hour driven out of paradise.” Mariana sees here a coincidence with the hours of the crucifixion and death of Jesus Christ.

We may mention in passing that the opinion of commentators concerning the length of time spent by our first parents in paradise is by no means unanimous. Menoch. (ad vers. 23), e.g., believes that they must have spent at least a few days in their garden of delight; Gordon (ad vers. 1) gives an opinion according to which Eve was tempted on the seventh day after her creation, and on the thirteenth day of the world's existence; according to Barcepha some commentators believe that Adam and Eve were 40 days in paradise as Jesus was 40 days in the desert; others hold that the paradisiacal state lasted 30 years, as the hidden life of Jesus lasted 30 years; others again grant Adam only six or nine hours of happiness before his fall; Usserius is of opinion that our first parents were placed in paradise only on the tenth day after the creation of the world (Nov. 1), and that they were expelled on the same day. According to Lev. xvi. 29 and xxii. 29, the same day became in the Jewish dispensation a day of penance and expiation (cf. Calmet, in vers. 23).

Regarding the phrase “at the air of day,” we may reasonably suppose that Moses understood by it the time of day at which usually a breeze sprang up in the country where he was writing. Travellers and geographers (e.g., Diodorus Siculus, l. iii. p. 127; Chardin, *Voyage en Perse*, t. iv. p. 18) tell us that in Arabia and Persia this happens towards sunset. Consequently, St. Jerome and the Septuagint rightly understand the phrase when they refer it to the afternoon air. A similar expression is found in Cant. ii. 17 and iv. 6, in which passages commentators understand it almost unanimously as signifying evening.

2. *Closer Determination of Time.*—The second and nearer determination of the time of God's merciful visit is contained in the clause “when they heard the voice of the Lord God walking in paradise.” The “voice” is by some authors said to have been thunder or the loud crashing of trees (cf. Menoch., a Lap., Gordon); others contend that it was a slight rustling of leaves, such as one makes by passing through a forest, or a mere outward sign of God's presence (Malvend.); others again explain it as an articulate sound formed either by an angel (Esti. s., a Lap., Gordon) or by God himself, i.e., by the



from the face of the Lord God, amidst the trees of paradise. And the Lord<sup>10</sup> God called Adam, and said to him: "Where art

second person of the Holy Trinity, appearing in human form (Mariana, St. August., l. xi. c. 33, de Gen. ad lit.). Similar apparitions of the second person are asserted to have taken place in the times of Abraham, Jacob, Moses, etc.; they are represented as a kind of trial of human nature on the part of God the Son, before he finally took upon himself a real human nature in the mystery of the incarnation (cf. Tertull. ii. c. Marcion.; Clement. i. Pedagog. c. vii.; Iren., l. iv. c. xvii.; Hilar., xii. de Trin.; Euseb., Hist. Eccl., init.; Synod. Sirmiens. c. xii.).

3. *Aggravating Circumstance.*—A third circumstance of God's visit of mercy to paradise is contained in the words "Adam and his wife hid themselves from the face of the Lord God, amidst the trees of paradise." Rosenmüller represents God's visit as representative of the daily tribute of worship which Adam and Eve had been accustomed to pay to God in the cool of the evening; after their sin this religious exercise was omitted. But this explanation alone does not satisfy the literal meaning of the above passage. Some authors believe that Adam and Eve hid themselves in the shrubbery surrounding the forbidden tree; supposing the latter to be a fig-tree, they say such would be the most natural course of action, since certain fig-trees are very large, and propagate by bending down their branches to the earth, where they cause them to take root and develop into separate trees (Malvend.; St. August., l. ii. de Gen. c. Manich.; St. Jerome, in Isaiah, l. ix. c. 29). We notice here one of the effects of Adam's sin; he seems to have even forgotten that God is omniscient and omnipresent. Among the reasons enumerated by a Lapidé why Adam recognized the approach of God, the first and last seem most satisfactory: Adam knew the manner of God's approach by previous experience, and, now in particular, the voice of his conscience manifested the nearness of the Judge.

<sup>10</sup> *b. Judicial Inquest.*—The conversation between our first parents and God, preliminary to the divine sentence, must next be considered. God's question: "Adam, where art thou?" is by several interpreters understood to be rather a reprimand or an admonition than a real question (St. Ambrose, de Paral. c. 14; Tertull., cont. Marcion, l. ii. c. 25; Origen, l. de recta fide; St. Basil, in Ps. cxiv.; St. August., l. xi. de Gen. ad lit. c. 34; cf. Philo, l. ii. Alleg. Legis p. 70). Still in the context we find a direct answer given, so that Adam must have understood God's words as a question.

"I was afraid," Adam answers, "because I was naked, and I hid myself." Some authors find a want of sincerity in these words. Adam, they say, was "ashamed" because he was naked, and so hid himself; he was "afraid" of the cause of his shame, his disobedience. But Cr  lier thinks that at this period Adam really felt his nakedness and his shame more vividly than he felt his guilt; he was more affected by the consequences of his sin than he was by the sin itself.

God's next question inquires directly after the cause of Adam's fear; it even points out the only reason that could have brought it



thou?" And he said: "I have heard thy voice in paradise, and I was afraid, because I was naked, and I hid myself." And he said to him: "And who hath told thee that thou wast naked, but that thou hast eaten of the tree whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldst not eat?" And Adam said: "The woman whom thou gavest me to be my companion gave me of the tree and I did eat." And the Lord said to the woman: "Why hast thou done this?" And she answered: "The serpent deceived me, and I did eat."

And the Lord God said to the serpent: "Because thou hast about. "Who hath told thee that thou wast naked, but that thou hast eaten of the tree whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldst not eat?" Estius remarks here that as Adam's sin of thought, his desire to be as God, had robbed him of sanctifying grace and of the infused virtues, so his sin of action stripped him of his immunity from concupiscence, and taught him, by the rebellion of the flesh, that he was naked. Adam's answer is considered by some interpreters as the completion of the sin through which he lost his paradisiacal state of innocence; to say the least, it is an excuse of his sin instead of being an acknowledgment of the same. The woman whom shortly before he had been afraid to displease, even at the risk of offending God, he now accuses unmercifully before the severe judge; God himself he accuses for having assigned him such a companion. His language too is expressive of the base selfishness which inspires his way of acting. Eve is merely the woman given him by God as a companion; of love for Eve, or anxiety for her welfare, there is not the slightest trace.

God now proceeds as judge, inquiring into the case before giving his verdict. "Why hast thou done this"—i.e., given to Adam of the forbidden fruit, so that he did eat? Instead of answering God's question directly, Eve gives an excuse for her own eating of the forbidden fruit. "The serpent deceived me, and I did eat." Cr  lier well remarks here that Eve did not say, "The serpent seduced me," but she used the expression "deceived me," as implying less culpability on her part.

<sup>11</sup> C. GOD'S SENTENCE.—In the last place the consequences of our first parents' sin, as manifested in God's sentence, must be investigated.

*a. Sentence against the Serpent.*—Without inquiring further into the serpent's guilt, the Lord at once begins his judicial sentence

1. *Subject of this Sentence.*—The punishment is held by some Fathers (cf. St. August., l. xi. de Gen. ad lit. c. 36, et de Gen. cont. Manich. l. ii. c. 26; St. Gregor. Great, Bed.) to have fallen on the devil alone; the serpent was not punished, because he had been a mere instrument of the devil. Other commentators maintain that the serpent alone was punished, because the literal meaning of the passage regards him alone, and also because the devil is incapable of either merit or demerit.

Not to enter into this latter question discussed by dogmatic theologians, we can easily understand why the serpent alone is spoken of

done this thing, thou art cursed among all cattle and beasts of the earth; upon thy breast shalt thou go, and earth shalt thou

in God's sentence, he alone had externally appeared to Eve, and whether God had revealed to Adam and Eve the true nature of the tempter must always remain doubtful. Consequently, it seems most probable that God's sentence fell on the serpent as he had acted in tempting Eve, there the devil had been the primary agent, the serpent the secondary, hence the punishment fell primarily on the devil, secondarily on the serpent (cf. St. Chrysost., hom. 17, in Gen.; Theodor., interrog. 34 in Gen.). Those who maintain that the serpent could not be punished, not being capable of committing a culpable action, must consider that all animals have been made for the good of man. Consequently, God may use them as instruments by which to show his detestation of sin. Instances of this we have in Ex. xxi, 29; Lev. xx, 15; Deut. vii, 25, xiii, 15; Jos. vii, 25.

2. *Punishment contained in the Sentence*—Passing next to the punishment inflicted on the serpent, we may consider first that inflicted on the serpent independently of man, then that inflicted on the serpent in his relation to man.

a. *Absolute Punishment*.—The absolute penalty is indicated in the words, "thou art cursed among all cattle and beasts of the earth, upon thy breast shalt thou go, and earth shalt thou eat all the days of thy life." Sa renders the first clause "cursed above all cattle and beasts of the earth," others explain it "cursed by all cattle and beasts of the earth." But the true meaning is that the serpent is taken from among all animals which are not cursed, and is cursed by God himself. The great abhorrence in which the serpent is held by all nations is a consequence of this curse, though this is expressed more clearly in a later clause. The phrase "upon thy breast shalt thou go" has induced Josephus, Sts. Ephrem and Chrysostom, Hengstenberg, Delitzsch, Keil, etc., to suppose that the serpent has suffered an organic change by reason of this divine curse (cf. Reinke, Beiträge, t. ii, pp. 385-414). But serpents found in the tertiary strata show the same organization that is found in the serpents of to-day. Hence, Lange and others have had recourse to a real, physical degradation of the serpent by reason of God's curse; the general organism remaining, however, unchanged. But such a supposition is not needed to save the truth of God's word. The locomotion and food of the serpent were most probably the same before the curse that they are now. But what formerly had been the mere result of nature became through the curse a kind of punishment, in so far as it was changed into a lasting symbol of the effects of sin.

As to the devil, Gordon and others are of opinion that no new punishment was given him through God's curse, but that his former punishment implied only a new relation to the temptation of our first parents. St. Augustine says that the devil goes on his breast and belly by tempting man to pride and luxury, represented respectively by breast and belly. St. Gregory (l. xxi, Moral. c. 2) explains the same expressions as denoting the devil's temptation to desires and acts of impurity, which are symbolized by the breast and belly. The phrase "earth shalt thou eat" denotes according to many writers

eat all the days of thy life. I will put <sup>12</sup> enmities between thee

that the devil's usual prey will consist of the very outcasts of mankind (cf. August., l. ii. de Gen. c. Manich., c. 17; Bed., Rupert., Hugo, Cajetan). The permanent character of the punishment is indicated by the clause "all the days of thy life."

<sup>12</sup> *b. Relative Punishment.*—The second part of the serpent's punishment consists in his changed relation to man.

*α. Enmity between the Woman and the Serpent.*—He had contracted, or feigned at least, a friendship with Eve; God declares that he will put enmities between the serpent and the woman. God does not name Adam as having enmities with the serpent, because Adam had not directly been tempted by the serpent; God wished also to obliterate any odium the woman might have incurred in the sight of Adam. The devil was affected by this punishment too, because it signified the beginning of a successful struggle of man against him. It was, of course, owing to God's special providence that the serpent was present when God pronounced the verdict. The word "woman" has the definite article in the Hebrew text, to signify that the same woman is meant who had been spoken of from the very beginning of the chapter. The word serpent, in the introduction to God's sentence, has the definite article for the same reason. The nature of the enmity is known from the nature of the preceding friendship; hence it will give man the power to avoid sin.

Though "the woman" refers, in its literal sense, to Eve, it denotes the Blessed Virgin at least typically. For not to mention the fact that the Fathers of the Church are unanimous in considering Eve as a type of Mary, there is a special reason for regarding her as such in the present passage. Catholic doctrine understands the passage as referring to our Blessed Lady; since we have denied the existence of such a literal reference, we are bound to uphold, at least, a typical one. It may be of interest to know that many authorities understand the prophecy in its literal meaning of the Blessed Virgin; among these are: Iren. (Hær. iii. 23), Epiphanius (Hær. iii. 78; xviii. 19), Proclus (Orat. in Nat. Dni. 19), Ps. Jerome (Ep. de viro perfecto 6), Fulbertus (serm. iv. in Nativ. B.V.), Bernard (Hom. 2 super Mis-sus 4), Isidore of Pelus (Ep. i. 426), Smits, Passaglia, Patrizi, Bade, etc.

*β. Enmity between the Woman's and the Serpent's Seed.*—The following phrase, between "thy seed and her seed," is in itself very clear. Seed signifies, by synecdoche, the offspring of plants and animals. Thus employed, it generally applies to the whole collection; but sometimes it designates an individual (cf. Gen. iv. 25; xv. 3; xxi. 13; 1. Kings i. 11; II. Kings vii. 12; I. Par. xvii. 11). Patrizi is of opinion that in the present clause the seed of the woman applies to an individual, on account of the singular number of the following personal pronoun—rendered "she" in our versions, but which, as it will be seen, refers to the seed—and of the pronominal suffix. For, says the learned author, "seed" in its collective sense is always referred to by a plural pronoun and suffix. Corlyu admits that this happens in eleven passages (Gen. xv. 13; xvii. 8, 9; Ex. xxx. 21; Lev. xxi. 17; IV. Kings xvii. 20; II. Esdr. ix. 2; Jer. xxiii. 8; xxx. 10; xxxiii. 26; xlvi. 27; Ezech. xx. 5, cf. Spicil. vol. i. p. 349), but de-

and the woman, and thy seed and her seed: she shall <sup>13</sup> crush thy head, and thou shalt lie in wait for her heel."

nies that it is always observed (Gen. xxii. 17; xxiv. 60). Hence it must be determined from the context whether in the present passage seed is taken in its collective sense or applies to an individual. This, however, may be said in general, that most probably the word must be taken in the same sense in both instances.

Another difficulty arises from the fact that seed in the signification of offspring may apply to either the physical progeny in its strict sense, or to a moral dependency on another, a similarity of state or character, a likeness of manners and principles (cf. Is. i. 4; lvii. 4; Ps. xxxvi. (xxxvii.) 28; Prov. xi. 21; Matt. iii. 7; xii. 34; Luke iii. 7; John viii. 44; Rom. iv. 12).

1. If it be asked what is meant by the seed of the serpent, there can be no doubt that we must understand the word in its physical and collective sense; as long as the question is restricted to the serpent proper, there is to be a perpetual enmity and warfare between the serpent kind and mankind.

2. But when the seed, not of the serpent proper, but of its agent, the devil, is in question, we may understand it to signify . *a.* all evil spirits (Matt. xxv. 41; Apoc. xii. 7,9); *b.* all bad men (Matt. xxiii. 33; John viii. 44); *c.* both evil spirits and bad men. With Corluy we believe that the serpent's, i.e., the devil's, seed in our passage most probably applies to bad men alone. They alone are called "brood of vipers" (Matt. iii. 7); "children of the devil" (Acts xiii. 10), while the evil spirits are commonly called the devil's angels (Matt. xxv. 41), and the rulers of the world of this darkness (Eph. vi. 12). If it be objected that evil spirits as well as bad men live in enmity with the seed of the woman, it must be remembered that the evil spirits are not the devil's seed in such a strict sense as bad men are. They are rather his equals than his offspring. It is therefore more in conformity with the personal opposition of enmity placed by God between the woman and the serpent, to restrict the serpent's seed to the collection of bad men.

In the next place we must determine what is meant by the seed of the woman. Two facts have already been noticed as affecting this question: 1. That the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent are opposed to one another in the passage under discussion, and must therefore be taken in the same sense, as far as the context will allow it; 2. that bad men properly constitute the serpent's seed in so far as the serpent represents the devil. Consequently, we must take the seed of the woman collectively, excluding, however, all *bad* men. Such a limited collective meaning of seed is by no means unknown in the language of Sacred Scripture; cf. Gen. xxi. 12 and Rom. ix. 7: in both passages the collective sense of the seed has been limited.

Reasons for this explanation of seed: 1. Tradition favors this explanation of seed: Josephus (Antiqu. i. 1), St. Ephrem (lib. Attende tibi 11), St. Ambrose (de fuga seculi, 42), St. Chrysostom (hom. 17 in Gen. 7), St. Jerome (quæst. in Gen. iii. 15); cf. a Lapide, Marius,

To the <sup>14</sup> woman also he said: "I will multiply thy sorrows, and

Bonfrerius, Calmet, Reinke, Himpel (Quartalschrift, 1859), Hengstenberg, etc.

2. The context requires that the seed of the woman be taken collectively. Two points must here be noticed: *a.* A successful enmity with the devil is carried on by all who are in the grace of Christ (John vi. 40-47; x. 7-9; xiv. 6; Acts iv. 12); but all who are united to Christ by his grace form with Christ one mystic body (I. Cor. xii. 12-14, 27; Eph. iv. 13; i. 22; Col. i. 18; Gal. iii. 24-28). In this sense therefore Christ alone, i.e., his mystical body alone, is the seed of the woman. *b.* The seed of the woman may be taken collectively even in an unlimited sense, so as to comprise the whole human race. For through Jesus Christ all men have obtained the power of successfully combating the serpent, though not all men make use of it.

3. The end of the prophecy requires that the seed of the woman be understood in its collective sense. For the prediction was to convey consolation to Adam and Eve. And how could they have been consoled by the mere assurance that some individual would at some future time overcome the devil? But great must have been their consolation when they understood that all could successfully strive against him, if they were only willing to do so. An implicit faith in the future Redeemer was sufficient in the case of those living in the Old Testament to secure the grace of Christ requisite for a successful struggle.

4. St. Paul (Rom. xvi. 20) appears to apply the seed of the woman to all the just taken collectively. Whenever the apostle seems to understand the expression of an individual (Gal. iii. 16), he argues not from the literal but from the mystical meaning of the word, supposing that the whole collection of the just is through Christ, the spiritual seed of Abraham. This signification of the term has been explained in 2 *a.*

5. In point of fact, the fulfilment of the prophecy warrants us in understanding "seed" in its collective meaning. Jesus Christ has not alone overcome the devil, but all the just by the grace of Christ have gained the same victory (cf. Luke x. 9; I. Pet. v. 9; I. John ii. 13; Col. ii. 15.) If such a victory is said to surpass the power of creatures (I. John iii. 8; Heb. ii. 14, 15), we understand that this is meant of creatures not aided by the grace of Jesus Christ. That God requires of every one a successful struggle against evil is so often insisted on that we need not multiply passages in its proof. Should we be told that no new enmity was put between the collective seed of the woman and the serpent's seed, we point to the fact that by virtue of the words "I will put enmities" the woman's seed was raised from the rank of the serpent's subject to that of its successful foe. This is sufficiently important to be considered as the fulfilment of the prediction. If the word "seed" is often used to denote an individual, or even the Messiah (Gen. xxii. 18; xxvi. 4; xxviii. 14; Is. iv. 2; Zach. iii. 8; vi. 12, etc.), it does not follow that it always has that meaning, especially in passages in which we have good reason for assuming the collective sense of the word. The patristic testimony in favor of the individual meaning of seed (Iren. Har. iv. 10;



thy conceptions; in sorrow shalt thou bring forth children, and

Cyprian, advers. Judæos. ii. 9; Leo the Great, Serm. 21) is fully outweighed by the patristic testimony given above. The authority of commentators named in the same place outweighs that of Suits, Patrizi, Bade, etc.

<sup>13</sup> *Crushing of the Serpent's Head.*—Now we come to a more vexed question. Must we read "she," or "he," or "it" shall crush thy head? In other words, is the woman the subject of the clause, or is the seed its subject? The latter interpretation is preferable, for the following reasons: 1. Excepting two codices, the Hebrew text gives everywhere the masculine form of the pronoun. Jewish tradition, as manifested in the pointing of the word, is unanimous in favor of the masculine form. Maimonides alone favors the feminine. 2. The context requires the masculine form of the pronoun, the noun which immediately precedes and to which the pronoun refers is masculine (seed), and in the following clause two pronominal suffixes which refer to the pronoun now in question are both masculine. 3. All the old versions favor the masculine form of the pronoun. From all the codices of the Septuagint, as well as from the language of all Greek Fathers who quote Gen. iii. 15, it is evident that the Septuagint had the masculine pronoun. Theophilus alone employs the neuter form "it;" but probably he employed this gender merely to correct a grammatical error without ceasing for that reason to indicate a masculine agent (cf. Gal. iii. 16; John i. 10-12; Matt. xxviii. 19; Luke viii. 5). St. Cyprian (c. Jud. ii. 9) and St. Jerome (quæst. heb. in Gen.) testify that the Itala read "he shall crush;" Leo the Great, Peter Chrysologus, and the translator of Irenæus bear witness to the same fact. If Rufinus' translation of Josephus (Antiqu. i. 3) reads "she" in our passage, it must be remembered that Rufinus has often substituted his own for his author's opinions. Regarding the Latin translation of St. Chrysostom the same must be said; for the better Greek codices have the masculine form "he." The Syriac and Samaritan versions too read "he shall crush." Onkelos favors the masculine "he;" Pseudo-Jonathan explains the word in a collective meaning.

The question concerning the relation of the pronoun "he" is more easily settled. We refer it to the word "seed," and not to "woman." Reasons: 1. Seed is the noun nearest to the pronoun "he" in the Hebrew text; but as a general rule pronouns refer back to the nearest noun agreeing with them in gender. 2. The pronoun in question agrees in gender with the noun "seed," not with "woman;" the same holds for the pronominal suffixes which in the same passage refer back to the pronoun itself, and through it to seed. 3. All the ancient versions, excepting the Vulgate, refer the pronoun to seed; the text of the Vulgate is the sole reason why some writers have referred it to woman. Corluy tells us that several Fathers and commentators openly assert the reference of the pronoun to the woman through the medium of the seed, i. e., that the woman shall crush the serpent's head in so far as her seed shall do so. Regarding the passages Gen. ii. 23; Eccl. xii. 4, Est. i. 20, in which feminine nouns or pronouns are joined to masculine verbs, it must be observed that



thou shalt be under thy husband's power, and he shall have dominion over thee."

the context explains this abnormal agreement; but the context of Gen. iii. 15 requires rather the reference of the masculine pronoun to the masculine noun "seed."

The two verbs "crush" and "lie in wait for" read in the Hebrew text alike, so that literally we should render the verb either by "crush" in both cases, or by "lie in wait for." The meaning "to crush" well suits the other passage of the Old Testament, in which the same verb certainly occurs (Job ix. 17). Regarding another occurrence, see Ps. cxxxviii. (cxxxix.) 11—(Hgst., Rödiger, Delitzsch, Fürst, Kalisch, Keil, Köhler, Schultz). The Targum (Syr., Samar., Saad, Pers., Ar. Erpen., Gr. Ven., Lth.) use the word in the same signification; but the Septuagint and Onkelos (Kno., Baur, Ewald, Dillm.) prefer the meaning "to lie in wait for." St. Jerome employs both these meanings, rendering the verb according to the context, by "crushing" in the first place, and by "lying in wait for" in the second. The double accusative following the verb in Hebrew points to a meaning "to attack," "to crush;" the construction does not occur with verbs meaning "to lie in wait for." Corluy is of opinion that a more general term, e.g., "to attack," would be more in keeping with the precise meaning of the verb—a meaning necessarily qualified by the context (cf. Delitzsch, *Neuer Commentar*, 1887, p. 106).

The serpent's head in our case is the reign of the devil (John xii. 31; Col. ii. 15; 1. John iii. 8), or the reign of sin (Rom. v. 21; vi. 16-18), the end of which is death (Rom. vi. 21-23). The crushing of the serpent's head implies a mortal wound (cf. John xiv. 30; xii. 31; xvi. 11), such as the reign of evil received at the foot of the cross. The heel of the seed is either the humanity of Jesus Christ or his mystical body, the Church. Against both the serpent has waged war, as both the gospels and history testify (cf. Apoc. xii. 13; Matt. xiii. 25; Job i. 6, 9; Zach. iii. 1; Apoc. xii. 10; Luke xxii. 31; Eph. ii. 2; vi. 11; 1. Pet. v. 8; Matt. xvi. 18; 1. Cor. x. 13). But the wounds inflicted by the serpent on the seed are slight and curable.

<sup>14</sup> *b. Sentence against Eve.*—It may be freely granted that Adam and Eve did not fully understand the meaning of the prophecy now discussed as we understand it in the light of its fulfilment. They did not know when, by whom, and how they were to be saved; but still the general assurance was given them that both they themselves and the seed of the woman should be enabled to carry on a successful enmity against the serpent, to overcome sin and temptation, to cultivate virtue, and finally to be received again into God's favor. But whatever may have been the insight into God's merciful promises granted to our first parents, it surely solicited to strengthen them under the weight of their own punishment.

Eve's sentence is in strict accord with her part in Adam's temptation and fall. Adam's conjugal love for his wife had been the lever which moved his will from the love of God; Eve's punishment consists precisely in her obligation of bearing the painful consequences

And to<sup>16</sup> Adam he said: "Because thou hast hearkened to the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldst not eat, cursed is the earth in thy work, with labor and toil shalt thou eat thereof all the days of thy life. Thorns and thistles shall it bring forth to thee, and thou shalt eat the herbs of the earth. In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return to the earth, out of which thou wast taken: for dust thou art, and into dust shalt thou return."

of Adam's conjugal love, which she had abused. Without noticing the opinion that her conceptions were actually increased beyond the number which they would have reached in paradise (Ephr.), we may safely regard the phrase as a Hebrew idiom, meaning: "I will multiply the sorrows of thy conceptions." Both gestation and childbirth would have been painless in man's state of innocence, but after the sin God's sentence states: "In sorrow shalt thou bring forth children." And as if it were not enough to be thus punished in the two physical consequences of her conjugal love, God adds the penalty of having to bear the evil of two moral effects of the same. The Hebrew text suggests the following meaning of this additional punishment: "notwithstanding the great pain which will follow, thou shalt desire after thy husband, or thy desires shall be conformable to thy husband's will, and he shall have dominion over thee." In the light of history the grievousness of the sentence becomes appalling. The degradation and moral slavery to which women were subject before the time of Christ, and to which they are even now exposed in unchristian nations, are so well known that they need no further description.

<sup>15</sup> *c. Sentence against Adam.*—Adam's punishment too well suits his sin: he had yielded to the love of a creature in preference to that of God, and now the creature will turn against him; he had eaten of the forbidden fruit, and now the earth will refuse him the necessary food; he had disobeyed his Maker and his God, and now the earth over which God has given him dominion will disobey him. Abuse of authority on the part of the rational creature will thus bring about rebellion and resistance on the part of the irrational creature.

The sentence itself develops the punishment step by step: 1. The earth is cursed in general, in so far as it will oblige Adam to toil for his food; 2. the uneatable products of the earth will be multiplied, its consumable products will deteriorate and grow scarce; 3. even these deteriorated articles of food will require hard labor; 4. all this will continue throughout Adam's life-time; 5. finally, the earth will reclaim man's body.

COROLLARY: THE MESSIANIC CHARACTER OF THE  
PASSAGE.

**1. CHRISTIAN TESTIMONY.**—The Fathers of the Church unanimously speak of Eve as the type of the Blessed Virgin Mary—a type founded both on the striking similitude and dissimilitude of its antitype. Referring to the learned work of Passaglia (*De imm. conceptione*, t. ii. pp. 812 f.) for the fuller development of this doctrine, we must for the present content ourselves with the view of the Church expressed clearly in her liturgy, the common reading of her authentic Latin version of the Bible, and the Papal bull “*Ineffabilis Deus*,” in which the dogma of the Immaculate Conception is taught *ex cathedra*. From all this we rightly infer that the Holy Ghost, when inspiring this prophecy, intended to point out typically the Blessed Mother Mary and her signal enmity against the devil. And since he even then clearly foreknew the whole extent of this enmity, we reasonably conclude that he also intended to foreshadow its plenitude, especially as it is manifested in her immaculate conception.

**2. RABBINIC TESTIMONY.**—But for the present we are rather in search of arguments for the Messianic interpretation of the Synagogue given to the so-called Protevangel. It is true that the Rabbinic writers have used the passage in a most curious context, which seems at first sight to exclude all Messianic interpretation. We need only refer to the commentary given of Gen. ii. 4, as explained in Ber. R. 12 (ed. Warsh. p. 24 b). The Hebrew word for generations, “*toledoth*,” is always written in the Bible without the quiescent letter ׀ (*vav*)—a letter signifying the numerical value six. In Gen. ii. 4 and Ruth iv. 18, however, the quiescent letter occurs in “*toledoth*.” This fact is thus interpreted by the Rabbinic authority above referred to. After the fall, i.e., subsequent to Gen. ii. 4, Adam lost *vav*, i.e., six things: his glorious sheen (Job

xiv. 20); life (Gen. iii. 19); his stature either by 100, or by 200, or by 300, or even by 900 cubits (Gen. iii. 8); the fruit of the ground; the fruits of the trees (Gen. iii. 17); and the heavenly lights. In Gen. ii. 4 the  $\gamma$  (vav) is still in the "toledoth," because Adam still possesses the six gifts, and the letter reappears in Ruth iv. 18, because these six things are to be restored to man by the "son of Pharez," or the Messiah. Though according to the literal rendering of Ps. xlviii. (xlix.) 12 (in Hebrew 13) man did not remain unfallen one single night, yet for the sake of the Sabbath the heavenly lights were not extinguished till after the close of the Sabbath. It is added that when Adam saw the darkness he was very much afraid, saying: "Perhaps he of whom it is written, 'he shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel,' cometh to molest and attack me," and he said: "The darkness shall surely cover me." In reference to the six things, compare: Judg. v. 31 b; Is. lxviii. 22; Lev. xxvi. 13; Zach. viii. 12; Is. xxx. 26 (cf. Edersheim, "The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah," 5th ed., New York, ii. p. 711).

3. But whatever may have given rise to such a context, Rabbinic literature certainly acknowledges the Messianic bearing of Gen. iii. 15. "The voice of the Lord God walking in paradise" is identified with the Shechinah and the Middle Column. The Targ. Jonathan has it: "And they heard the voice of the Word of the Lord which walked about in the garden." The Jerusalem Targ. has in the following verse: "And the Word of the Lord called Adam." Tikkune Zohar (c. 6 prine.) writes: "They heard the voice of the Lord, which was the Middle Column, and the Shechinah was with it. The voice walking in the garden was the Middle Column." And again: "The voice in the garden was the Shechinah." And in another place (Bammidbar Rabba, sect. 13, fol. 218, i.) it is written: "Was not the principal occupation of the Shechinah this, that it dwelled on earth? as it is written: And they heard the voice of the Lord walking in the garden." Philo has the following

remarks (*De somniis*, p. 461): "The Holy Word has commanded some what to do, as their king; others it has usefully instructed as a teacher informs his disciples; others, again, it has advised in the best manner as their counsellor, since they could not advise themselves. Besides, it has committed to others all kinds of secrets, which an uninitiated person must not hear. At times, too, it asks persons: Where art thou? as it asked Adam." Moreover, the Messiah is represented by the Rabbinic writers as having repeatedly visited our parents in paradise (*Bereshith Rabba*, sect. 11, fol. 11, 3; sect. 12, fol. 12, 4; *Zohar chadash*, fol. 82, 4).

The thirteenth verse of the context is also explained so as to allude to the Messiah. For *Tikkune Zohar* (c. 98, princ.) paraphrases the words, "Why hast thou done this?" so as to refer the "this" to the Messiah. In this manner the sin committed against "this" has been committed against the *Shechinah*.

But it is especially when treating of the fifteenth verse that the Rabbinic writers become clear and definite beyond all possible misunderstanding. The Jerusalem Targum thus paraphrases the passage: "And it shall come to pass, when the children of the woman shall labor in the law, and perform the commandments, that they shall bruise and smite thee on the head, and shall kill thee; but when the children of the woman shall forsake the precepts of the law, and shall not perform the commandments, thou shalt bruise and smite them on their heel and hurt them; but there shall be remedy for the children of the woman, but for thee, O serpent, there shall be no remedy; for hereafter they shall to each other perform a healing in the heel, in the latter end of the days, in the days of King Messiah."

The Targum of Jonathan speaks in the same strain, and then concludes: "Nevertheless there shall be a remedy for them, but to thee there shall not be a remedy; for they shall hereafter perform a healing in the heel in the days of King Messiah."

The Talmud *Sota* (fol. 49, col. 2) speaks of the heels of

the Messiah, and thus describes the time when they will be bruised: " Rabbi Pinchas, the son of Yair, said: ' Since the destruction of the Temple, the Sages and the Nobles are ashamed and cover their heads. The wonder-workers are disdained, and those who rely upon their arm and tongue have become great. There is none who teaches Israel, none who prays for the people, none who inquires [of the Lord]. Upon whom, then, are we to trust? Upon our Father who is in heaven.' Rabbi Eliezer the Great said: ' Since the destruction of the Temple, the Sages have commenced to be like school-masters, and the school-masters like precentors, and the precentors like the laymen, and these too grow worse, and there is none who asks or inquires. Upon whom, then, are we to trust? Upon our Father who is in heaven. In the footprints of the Messiah impudence will increase, and there will be scarcity. The vine will produce its fruit, but wine will be dear. The government will turn itself to heresy, and there will be no reproof. And the house of assembly will be for fornication. Galilee will be destroyed, and Gablan laid waste, and men of Gebul will go from city to city and find no favor. And the wisdom of the scribes will stink, and those who fear sin will be despised, and truth will fail. Boys will confuse the faces of old men. Old men will rise up before the young. The son will treat the father shamefully, and the daughter will rise up against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law, and a man's foes will be those of his own household. The face of that generation will be as the face of a dog; the son will have no shame before his father. Upon whom, then, are we to trust? Upon our Father who is in heaven '" (l. c., col. a.b.).

The fifteenth verse receives a Messianic interpretation also in Zohar Gen. (fol. 76, col. 301; fol. 77, col. 305), where the phrase " he shall crush thy head " is once applied to the Messiah, and again to the ever-blessed God. Schöttgen conjectures that the Talmudic designation of " heels of the Messiah " (Sot. 49 b., line 2 from top) in reference to the



near advent of the Messiah in the description of the troubles of those days (cf. St. Matt. x. 35, 36) may have been chosen partly with a view to this passage.

Then again, the words of Eve at the birth of Seth (Gen. iv. 25) seem to have reference to our prophecy. For "another seed" is explained as seed that comes from another place, and referred to the Messiah in Ber. R. 23 (ed. Warsh. p. 45 b., lines 8 and 7 from the bottom). The same explanation occurs twice in the Midrash on Ruth iv. 19 (in the genealogy of David, ed. Warsh. p. 46 b.), the second time in connection with Ps. xxxix. (xl.) 8, "in the volume of the book it is written of me," Ruth belonging to the class of "volumes," Megilloth, which consisted of Cant., Ruth, Lament., Eccles., Esther.

Besides all these references, the Rabbinic passages which represent the Messiah as a true man, and which describe his birth and childhood, testify to his being the son of a woman.

## CHAPTER III.

THE MESSIAS IS THE SON OF SEM. GEN. IX. 18-27.<sup>1</sup>

## INTRODUCTION.

**MESSIANIC CHARACTER OF THE PROPHECY.**—*a.* **Reasons from the Text.**—1. The very words indicate that Jahveh, the God of the supernatural order, will be the God of Sem. It is therefore quite plain that all the supernatural blessing of the human race will come through Sem's family. 2. Besides, it is implied that these blessings will be many and various; instead of enumerating them all, the holy patriarch simply praises Jahveh for them: "Blessed be Jahveh, the God of Sem." 3. Bochart (*Phaleg*, ii. 65 seqq. ed. iv.) beautifully explains why Noe does not bless Sem in his own person, as he blesses Japhet and curses Chanaan. For the evil that is in us, and to some extent also the natural and supernatural good, is owing to ourselves, but the benefit of redemption is owing to God's goodness alone. Hence, Noe blesses God when he comes to speak of Sem. 4. It must also be noted that the present prophecy is the counterpart of the *protevangelium*: the latter indicates

<sup>1</sup> The passage may be divided into two parts: 1. Verses 18-24 give an account of the occasion which gave rise to Noe's prophecy; 2. Verses 25-27 contain the triple prophecy. Before describing the occasion of the patriarch's blessing, the inspired writer briefly states the importance of the whole incident. As the first Messianic prophecy is connected with the sin of the first father of the whole human race, so is the second promise connected with a material sin of the second father of the human race. Hence it is that the three sons of the patriarch are enumerated and represented as the progenitors of the whole human family.

that the redemption will come through the seed of the woman, i.e., through man; Noe's prophecy announces that our supernatural good will come through God's special dwelling in the tents of Sem, i.e., through God. In the subsequent development of the Messianic prophecies sometimes the human side of the Redeemer, sometimes the divine side, is represented, until finally the two lines of predictions coalesce in the God-man Jesus Christ (cf. Briggs, "Messianic Prophecy," pp. 82 f.).

**b. Reasons from Authority.**—*St. Augustine* understands the prophecy in a Messianic sense where he explains the blessing of Japhet: "It was precisely this that was predicted when it was said: May God enlarge Japhet, and may he dwell in the tents of Sem, i.e., in the churches which the sons of the prophets, the apostles, have constructed." The Messianic reference of the blessing is then, according to the great African Doctor, certain beyond all doubt. *St. Jerome* too refers Noe's words to the same Messianic fulfilment (*Quæstiones Gen.*, Opp. t. iii. p. 134): "When he says: May he dwell in the tents of Sem, he prophesies about us, who are in possession of the knowledge and the science of the Scriptures after Israel has been rejected." Even *Jonathan* explains the holy patriarch's words concerning Sem as referring to Sem's spiritual blessedness: "The Lord will render illustrious the boundary of Japhet, and his sons will become proselytes, and live in the school of Sem." *St. Justin* agrees in his exposition with that of *St. Augustine*, interpreting the living of the Japhetites in the tents of Sem as their conversion to the faith in Christ (cf. *Justin.*, *Dialog. cum Tryphone*, *August.*, *de Civitate Dei*, l. xvi. c. 2, etc.). *Rupertus* too sees in the patriarch's blessing a prediction of the Gentiles' conversion to Christianity (l. iv. in *Gen.*). As to Jewish authorities, we may first of all point to the above words of the Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan. The ancient book *Bereshith Rabba* (sect. 36, fol. 35, 4) remarks on "may he dwell in the tents of Sem": "The Shechinah

dwells only in the tents of Sem." And since the Shechinah is repeatedly identified with the Messiah, it follows that the treatise quoted sees a Messianic reference in Noe's words.

**c. Reasons from Convenience.**—It may be of interest to consider a few reasons which show *a priori*, as it were, the Messianic reference of Noe's blessing to the Messianic times. *a.* When the human race is split up into different families, the divine names too are distributed among the various families: Elohim is the God of the Japhetites, Jahveh is the God of the Semites (cf. Orelli, "Old Testament Prophecy," p. 98). It is therefore fit that on the same occasion the general promise of salvation given to the whole human race should be in so far particularized as to determine the branch which would be the saving mediator. *b.* Again, since Messianic promises are connected with all the mediators with whom God made a special covenant—with Adam, Abraham, Moses—it is antecedently probable that a Messianic promise should be connected with the remaining Old Testament mediator too; for the covenant which God made with Noe is the second of the four great covenants regulating the relations between God and man before the time of Jesus Christ (cf. Elliott, "Old Testament Prophecy," p. 194).

**d. Exceptions Answered.**—1. If any one should find it hard to understand the tents of Sem as designating the Church, it must be kept in mind that the word has a similar figurative meaning repeatedly. Thus in Zach. xii. 7 "the tents of Juda," in Mal. ii. 12, "the tents of Jacob" are designations for the theocracy. In the Gospel of Luke, xvi. 9, there is question of a reception into everlasting habitations, instead of admittance into the kingdom of God. At any rate, this difficulty affects only those who prefer Japhet to God as the subject of the clause "may he dwell in the tents of Sem." 2. The exception that several of the patristic testimonies are irrelevant, because they evidently regard Japhet and not God as the subject of the

clause "may he dwell," is not to the point. For whatever special interpretation they may give of the details of Noe's prophecy, they certainly refer the whole to the Messiah, and this is all we need for the truth of our thesis.

**e. Arguments from the New Testament.**—Finally, the Messianic promise given to Noe, or rather through Noe to Sem, is several times alluded to in the New Testament. St. Paul, in his epistle to the Ephesians (ii. 14), consoles them with the following words: "For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and breaking down the middle wall of partition, the enmities in his flesh." These words alone would perhaps be too obscure to be taken as an allusion to the partition between the three human races; but then the apostle adds (ii. 19): "Now, therefore, you are no more strangers and foreigners: but you are fellow-citizens with the saints, and the domestics of God." What more striking fulfilment of the prediction "may Japhet dwell in the tents of Sem," i.e., of Jahveh's special client, could St. Paul have pointed out in the Christian dispensation? And lest any one should imagine that Sem has been dispossessed entirely of his tents, the same apostle writes to the Romans (xi. 25): "For I would not have you ignorant, brethren, of this mystery (lest you should be wise in your own conceits): that blindness in part hath happened in Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles should come in, and so all Israel should be saved."

#### GEN. IX. 18-27.

And <sup>2</sup>the sons of Noe, who came out of the ark, were Sem, Cham, and Japhet, and Cham is the father of Chanaan. These

<sup>2</sup> **The sons of Noe.** The question asked here is whether the three sons are enumerated according to their age. *a.* The order, Sem, Cham, Japhet, is followed in Gen. v. 32; vi. 10; vii. 13; ix. 6; x. 1; hence St. Augustine, St. Eucherius, a Lapide, Rosenmüller, Keil, Dillmann, and others have inferred that Cham was older than Japhet and younger than Sem. *b.* On the other hand, Lamy, Knobel, Delitzsch, Lange, and others contend that Cham was the youngest of Noe's sons, on account of verse 24: "when he heard what his *younger* son had done to him." For the Hebrew expression translated

three are the sons of Noe, and from these was all mankind spread over the whole earth. And Noe, a husbandman,<sup>3</sup> began to till the ground, and planted a vineyard. And drinking of the wine, was made drunk, and was<sup>4</sup> uncovered in his tent. Which when Cham, the father of Chanaan, had seen, to wit that his father's nakedness was uncovered, he told it to his two brethren without. But Sem and Japhet put a cloak upon their shoulders, and going backward, covered the nakedness of their father; and their faces

"younger" has the meaning of a comparative only when there is question of two, while it has the force of the superlative when it refers to more than two (cf. Gen. xxvii. 15; xxix. 18; xlii. 13; xliv. 2; I. Kings xvi. 11; xvii. 12-14). As to the passages above cited for the previous opinion, the adherents of the second opinion say that the Bible does not always follow the order of seniority in its enumerations (cf. I. Par. i. 28; ii. 2). That Sem was the eldest of Noe's sons is evident from Gen. x. 21: "Of Sem also, the father of all the children of Heber, the elder brother of Japhet, sons were born." *c.* In order to do justice to both opinions, it must be stated that the adherents of the first sometimes explain the phrase "his *younger* son" as referring to Noe's grandson Chanaan, who had first of all seen the patriarch's nakedness and made light of it; it was probably he who had told Cham of it. Again, the LXX. Symm., Ven., Lth., and the Masoretic accentuators interpret Gen. x. 21 as meaning "the brother of Japhet, the eldest," so that according to them Japhet, Cham, Sem would be the order of seniority. *d.* Wellhausen and Budde's assertion that the original text read Sem, Japhet, Chanaan, and that Cham has been inserted by the compiler, falls with their system of Pentateuch criticism.

<sup>3</sup> **Noe began to till the ground.** It is not stated whether the cultivation of the vine was known before the flood, or was first introduced by Noe. Matt. xxiv. 38 inclines us to believe that the use of wine existed even before the earth was visited by the deluge. But whatever we may think of this point, St. Chrysostom, Theodoret, and St. Jerome are of opinion that Noe's drunkenness was not sinful, because he did not know the strength of the wine; St. Ephrem excuses the patriarch from all sin because his intoxication was due to his total abstinence from all strong drink practised for many years previous to the occurrence which gave rise to the prophecy now under consideration.

<sup>4</sup> **Was uncovered.** The fact that Noe uncovered himself is probably owing to the heat of the wine. Thus was he who had not been touched by the waters of the flood overcome by the influence of wine. The Fathers see in Noe thus exposed a type of Christ hanging naked on the cross (Jerome, c. Lucif.; Aug. Cyprian, etc.). The Hebrew text speaks of "the cloak" instead of "a cloak," thus indicating that Noe had thrown off his cloak like garment, or the simlah, and that Sem and Japhet replaced the same. The phrase "awaking from the wine" means nothing else but awaking from the effects of the wine.



were turned away, and they saw not their father's nakedness. And Noe, awaking from the wine, when he had learned what his younger son had done to him, he <sup>5</sup> said: "Cursed be <sup>6</sup> Chanaan,

<sup>5</sup> **He said.** Having thus far considered the occasion of the prophecy, we must now review the prediction itself. As to form, it consists of three members: the first is a curse of Chanaan; the second blesses Sem and again curses Chanaan; the third blesses Japhet and probably Sem, but certainly insists again on the curse of Chanaan. A few remarks must be made about each of the three members: 1. Why is Chanaan cursed instead of Cham? 2. What is the precise meaning of the Hebrew word which is translated by "enlarging"? 3. What is the subject of the clause "may he dwell in the tents of Sem"? 4. What are the tents of Sem?

<sup>6</sup> **Cursed be Chanaan.** 1. The substitution of Chanaan for Cham as the subject of the patriarch's curse has been variously explained by different authors. *a.* If we accept in the first place the opinion of several Jewish writers (cf. Origen, *Selecta* in Gen.) that Chanaan was the first who had sinned against Noe's authority, his punishment will appear the natural consequence. *b.* But even without this supposition, Cham, Noe's youngest son, was severely punished in the curse of his youngest son, as all the parents suffer in the misfortune of their children. *c.* Chanaan was chosen as the subject of the predicted punishment, because God in his wisdom foresaw the future perverseness of Chanaan's race. *d.* At all events, when there is question of merely temporal punishments, it is not at all uncommon that the innocent are made to suffer instead of the guilty, even down to the fourth generation (cf. Gen. xx.). *e.* The Fathers think that Noe did not inflict his curse directly on Cham because he did not consider himself authorized to curse him whom God had blessed on his leaving the ark. *f.* Others again think that all Cham's descendants were cursed, but that Chanaan is mentioned to animate Israel against its enemies, the Chanaanites.

The curse itself consists in Chanaan's becoming the servant of servants, i.e., the vilest servant, to his brethren; and such has become Chanaan's condition, both morally and socially. The moral standing of Chanaan's descendants is well illustrated by the cities of the Plain and the corruption of the Chanaanite races as described by Moses (cf. Lev. xviii., xx., Deut. xii. 31). The immorality of the Phœnicians and the Carthaginians was proverbial even in Pagan antiquity (cf. Münter, "Religion der Carthager," pp. 250 ff.). The history of Chanaan's social standing is equally significant. As Moses and Josue, and later on Solomon, subjected the Chanaanites of Palestine to the rule of Sem's descendants (Jos. ix. 21 ff.; III. Kings ix. 20 ff.), so did the Japhetites subdue the Phœnicians and the Carthaginians by means of the Persians, the Greeks, and the Romans. Even the Egyptian descendants of Cham have shared the same fate of slavery, or they are even now involved in the more galling chains of sin and idolatry. It may be noted, by the way, that if the passage containing Chanaan's curse had been composed after the destruction of the Chanaanites by means of the Israelites, it surely would have been couched in far different language; there would

a servant of servants shall be unto his brethren." And he said:

have been at least traces of the manner in which the fulfilment of the supposed prediction was really accomplished.

If it be asked what became of the other sons of Cham, since they are not at all mentioned in the whole passage, *a.* Lange and Delitzsch see in this total silence a bad omen for their future. *b.* Others, like Keil, are of opinion that all the sons of Cham were virtually cursed in their youngest brother Chanaan. The curse here spoken of does not, however, exclude from life eternal; here, as in the case of Esau, it refers directly to the temporal welfare of its objects. If the children who must thus bear the sins of their parents serve God with their whole heart, their want of temporal prosperity will prove a spiritual blessing.

<sup>1</sup> **May God enlarge Japhet.** 2. The second point concerning which interpreters differ is the exact meaning of the Hebrew word translated "may (God) enlarge." The primary meaning of the verb seems to be "to persuade, to enable one to do a thing." *A.* Owing to this fact, several interpreters have translated "*alliciat Deus Japhetum, ut habitet in tentoriis Semi.*" There are, however, a number of reasons militating against this interpretation: *a.* Only Piel is said to be used in the above sense, while the verb in the present passage is in the Hiphil form. *b.* Besides, the meaning "to persuade" appears to be mostly used in its bad sense; however, in Jer. xx. 7 it has a good sense. *c.* The verb in the sense "to persuade" is always used with the accusative, not with the preposition  $\bar{\text{ל}}$ , as it is used in the instance now under consideration. *B.* This last motive has induced Kelle to translate, "May God intercede for Japhet." But this interpretation appears very unnatural. *C.* Hence it is preferable to follow the interpretation of the LXX, the Vulgate, Onkelos, and the Arabic version, which give to the verb the meaning "to be broad," a meaning which it has also in Prov. xx. 19. The corresponding Chaldee verb is commonly taken in the sense "to be broad." Besides all this, it is worthy of note that verbs of a similar import are elsewhere construed with the preposition  $\bar{\text{ל}}$  (cf. Gen. xxvi. 22; Ps. iv. 2; Prov. xviii. 16). The prediction which results from this interpretation, that Japhet is to have a numerous posterity which shall possess widely extended territories, has found its historical fulfilment; the descendants of Japhet have gained possession not only of all Europe, but also of a large portion of Asia, America, and Australia.

<sup>2</sup> **May he dwell.** 3. A third question is raised about the subject of the clause "may he dwell in the tents of Sem." Is it of Japhet that this wish is expressed, or does it refer to God himself? *A.* The Targum of Onkelos, Philo, Maimonides, Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Baumgarten, Delitzsch, Conant, Lewis, St. Ephrem, Theodoret, Lyranus, Tostatus, and others are of opinion that God is the subject of the clause. The reasons for this view may be reduced to the following (cf. Briggs, "Messianic Prophecy," pp. 82 f.): *a.* It is probable that the subject of the preceding verb continues in the present clause, especially on account of the law of parallelism. *b.* The whole prophecy consists of seven lines. The first two contain Chanaan's curse; the

"Blessed be the Lord God of Sem, be Chanaan his servant. May

second two contain Sem's blessing and Chanaan's curse by way of refrain, Sem and Chanaan being co-ordinated. Hence it is probable that in the last three lines, in which all three are mentioned, Sem, Chanaan, and Japhet are co-ordinated too. But this would not be the case if Japhet were the subject of the clause "may he dwell"; for on that supposition Japhet becomes the central figure of the tristich. *c.* Another reason for not subordinating Sem to Japhet in the last tristich is the fact that Sem is the more prominent in the whole context. *d.* In the previous distich God is called the God of Sem; hence it seems proper that the God of Sem will live in the tents of Sem. *e.* If Japhet were to dwell in the tents of Sem, the natural inference would be that Japhet would conquer Sem's territory—an interpretation which implies Sem's humiliation. *f.* The subsequent history and the development of the Messianic prophecies show that Sem should be the prominent figure in the whole prophecy. If God be taken as the subject of the clause "may he dwell," this end is obtained in a most striking and beautiful way: Chanaan is cursed thrice, Sem is blessed twice, and Japhet is blessed once.

*B.* On the other hand, it must be remembered that Chrysostom, Augustine, Jerome, Michaelis, Vater, Gesenius, Drach, Lamy, Rosenmüller, Knobel, Tuel, Delitzsch, Ewald, Dillmann, and others make Japhet the subject of the clause "may he dwell in the tents of Sem." The reasons for this interpretation are reduced by Delitzsch (*Neuer Commentar über die Genesis*, in h. l.) to the following headings: *a.* As the preceding distich has Sem for the subject of its blessing, so must the last tristich have Japhet for the subject of its benediction. *b.* Though the verb in the clause under consideration often signifies God's dwelling anywhere, still this idea is already implicitly contained in the distich where God is called the God of Sem. *c.* Sem's God is named Jahveh, while according to the above interpretation Elohim would be the God dwelling in the tents of Sem. *d.* The plural "tents" appears to indicate a plural or collective subject, and the idea that God dwells in the tent of any Israelite is foreign to the Old Testament as being contrary to the belief in the one place of divine worship. *e.* The dwelling of Japhet in Sem's tents beautifully shows that the two brothers are to share the divine blessing, as they were sharers in the act of filial piety. *f.* Delitzsch himself rejects St. Justin's statement that this prediction found its fulfilment when the Romans subdued Palestine, because such a prophecy would have been a curse rather than a blessing. *g.* Dillmann sees in the words a prediction of the future reception of the Japhetites into the Semitic kingdoms. But it is more likely that the prophecy regards Sem's tents taken in their more limited meaning, i.e., as the tents of Israel; thus the future salvation of the Japhetites by means of the Israelite Messiah would be predicted. *h.* The Talmud, too, takes Japhet to be the subject of the clause "may he dwell," and infers from this passage the lawful use of the Greek language in the sacred service of the Synagogue (*Megilla* 9b; *jer. Megilla* i. 9).

<sup>9</sup> In the tents of Sem. 4. Finally, it is of interest (*a*) that several

God<sup>7</sup> enlarge Japhet, and may<sup>8</sup> he dwell in the<sup>9</sup> tents of Sem, and Chanaan be his servant."

#### COROLLARY.

*a.* By means of this prophecy the Messianic blessings were certainly connected with the family of Sem. *b.* Probably it was also understood that man's salvation was to be accomplished by God's dwelling in a special manner among men.

authors translate, "in the tents of a name" or "in tents of glory," instead of "in the tents of Sem." Though writers like Gesenius, de Wette, Knobel, Anger, and Schrader advocate this interpretation, (*b*) it is very improbable that the same term should serve as proper name and as common noun in the same passage. Hence the common opinion is preferable.

It has, no doubt, been perceived that the reasons for making "Japhet" the subject of the clause "may he dwell" are not so cogent as those for looking on Jahveh as the subject. The Royal Psalmist seems to have taken this view of the passage when he says (Ps. cxxxi. (cxxxii.) 13, 14): "The Lord hath chosen Sion: he hath desired it for his habitation. This is my rest for ever: here will I dwell, for I have desired it."

## CHAPTER IV.

### THE MESSIAS IS THE SON OF ABRAHAM, ISAAC, AND JACOB.

Gen. xii. 1-9; xvii. 1-9; xviii. 17-19; xxii. 16-18; xxvi. 1-5; xxviii. 10-15.

#### INTRODUCTION.

**1. TIME AND PLACE OF THE PROPHECIES.**—1. With his father Thare, his wife Sarai, and his nephew Lot, Abram left Ur of the Chaldees for Haran, in obedience to a call of God (Acts vii. 2-4). Thare himself was the son of Nachor, son of Sarug, son of Reu, son of Phaleg, son of Heber, son of Sale, son of Kainan (LXX.), son of Arphaxad, son of Sem. It appears, therefore, that Abraham belonged to the family to which Noe had promised the mediatorship of the Messianic blessing.

We must briefly state the different opinions existing concerning the Ur of the Chaldees. *a.* According to a Talmudic tradition Abraham had been thrown by his idolatrous countrymen into a burning furnace because he had not been willing to conform with their idolatrous practices. God delivered the patriarch from this fire of the Chaldees (Ur of the Chaldees), and the Mosaic record narrates in the present passage this miraculous delivery. In confirmation of this opinion II. Esdr. ix. 7 (Vulg.) may be cited, where "Ur of the Chaldees" is translated by "fire of the Chaldees" (cf. Gen. xi. 28, 31; xv. 7; Acts vii. 2; Jud. v. 6-9). This explanation does not appear probable.

*b.* Another opinion considers Ur of the Chaldees as identical with the land of the Chaldees (LXX., Ewald, Stanley), or as meaning a mountain of the Chaldees (Kno-

bel). But unless these authorities bring better reasons for their view, it does not appear tenable.

c. An old tradition identifies Ur of the Chaldees with Orfah or Edessa. This tradition seems to reach back to the date of Ephrem (330-370). The ancient name of Edessa appears to have been Orrha as early as the time of Isidore (c. B.C. 150). Pocock (Description of the East, vol. i. p. 159) gives this tradition as the common opinion among the Jews, and even at present the principal mosque of the city is the "Mosque of Abraham," as the pond in which the sacred fish is kept bears the name "Lake of Abraham the Beloved" (Ainsworth, "Travels in the Track," etc., p. 64). Again, "Ur of the Chaldees" may be rendered "light of the Chaldees," a title that would be given in the East on account of any remarkable feature of natural beauty, as Damascus is called "the eye of the East."

d. Another tradition appears in the Talmud and in some of the early Arabian writers, which finds Ur in Warka, the Ὀρχόνη of the Greeks and probably the Ereeh of Sacred Scripture, called *Opèχ* in the LXX. version. This place bears the name Huruk in the native inscriptions, and was known to the Jews as the "land of the Chaldees." Ewald and Stanley may be understood as holding this opinion.

e. Another opinion, again, which is not supported by any tradition, identifies the "Ur of the Chaldees" with a castle existing in Eastern Mesopotamia, between Hatra and Nisibis, which is mentioned by Ammianus Marcellinus (xxv. 8, col. 26). The chief arguments in favor of this opinion are the identity of the castle's name with "Ur of the Chaldees," and its position between Arrapachitis, the supposed home of Abraham's ancestors, and Haran, whither he went from Ur.

f. Finally, there is another obscure tradition which places the "Ur of the Chaldees" south of Babylon, though it distinguishes the place from Warka (Journal of Asiatic Society, vol. xii. p. 481, note 2). This tradition may be traced in Eupolemus (c. B.C. 150) as quoted by Eusebius



(Præp. Ev. ix. 17), who identifies Ur with a Babylonian city known as Camarina. Now Camarina is the city of the moon, Kamar signifying "moon" in Arabic, and Khaldi bearing the same meaning in Old Armenian. The Babylonian city of the moon was Hur, as appears from the brick-inscriptions found on the ruins of Umgheir or Mugheir, situated on the ancient site of Hur, on the right bank of the Euphrates. The Ur of the Chaldees therefore is identical with the Babylonian Hur, the Camarina of Eupolemus, and the present Mugheir or Umgheir. But there are other reasons besides this identity of name and of worship that point to Mugheir as the Ur of the Chaldees. The inscriptions distinguish between "mat Assur" (Assyria), "mat Aram" (northern and western Aramæa), "mat Chatti" (the region of the Hittites), "mat Acharri" (the land of the Chanaanites), "mat Babilu" (Babylonia), and "mat Kaldn" (land of the Chaldees). Now this last country is generally placed south of Babylon, as all grant. Hence "Ur of the Chaldees" cannot be identified with Edessa or the above-mentioned castle (cf. Schrader, K. A. T., 2d ed. 1883, pp. 129 ff.). It follows from the existence of the great temple of the moon in Umgheir (cf. Jos. xxiv. 2), from its early social and political importance, and from the name Hur, which is, letter for letter, the Hebrew חור, that Mugheir, and not Warka, was the dwelling place of Abraham's ancestors. Finally, it seems entirely improbable that Warka, which is known in Genesis as Erech, should in the passages referring to the patriarch be named Ur. The exception that on our supposition Abraham would have had to cross the Euphrates twice in his migration is of little importance, because the patriarch, being a herdsman, naturally followed the path in which he found good pasture for his flocks.

2. Haran, probably the elder brother of Abram, was already dead at the time of the patriarch's leaving Ur; Nachor remained behind. Hence, when Thare, too, had died in Haran, Abram became the head of the family, and now re-

ceived his second call. Obedient to his call, he crossed the Euphrates near Zeugma (some writers consider this call of Abram identical with that given in Ur of the Chaldees, translating the verb in the beginning of ch. xii., "and the Lord had said to Abram") and entered the land of Chanaan by the valley of the Jabbok; he crossed at once into the rich valley of Moreh, near Sichem, where he received a distinct promise of his future inheritance (Gen. xii. 7) and built his first altar to God. Owing, as it appears, to the presence of the Chanaanite in the land, Abram made his resting-place in the strong mountain country between Bethel and Hai. When there was a famine in the country, he went down to Egypt, where his wealth increased considerably, so much so that, after his return, he and Lot had to separate. Abram was now enabled to take up his dwelling-place in the more convenient Mambre or Hebron. It was from this city that the patriarch went forth against Chodorlahomor and his companion-kings (Schrader, *K. A. T.*, 2d ed. 1883, pp. 135 ff.), after they had captured his nephew together with the substance of the cities of the Plain. After this occurrence Melchisedech made his appearance before Abram.

3. It may not be out of place to look upon the divine promise which followed the events just related as beginning a new period in the patriarch's life. God appeared to Abram (c. xv.), promising him a son to be his heir. But the long Israelite captivity in Egypt is also predicted, and the temporal promise regarding the land of Chanaan is repeated. In consequence of this, Abram takes Agar as concubine, and begets Ismael.

4. The voice of God is now silent for fourteen years, during which period the patriarch seems to have remained at Mambre. At the end of this time God again appeared and made a solemn and everlasting covenant with Abram, whose name he now changes to Abraham. The numerous posterity which has been repeatedly promised is again foretold in c. xvii., but in c. xviii. a son is distinctly promised

to Sarai, whose name had been previously changed to Sara. The patriarch pleads for the cities of the Plain, but their wickedness had reached its full measure; the towns are destroyed, only Lot with his family being saved. The promised son is born at last, but only after Abraham had moved towards the south country, into the territory of the Philistines. Agar with Ismael is now sent away.

5. Twenty-five years (Jos. Antiq. I. xiii. 2) pass in peace and quiet, when God again appears to the patriarch, in order to subject him to the greatest trial of his life. Isaac is to be sacrificed, and in spite of all his natural repugnance, the holy patriarch obeys the voice of God (c. xxii.). New promises more emphatic and comprehensive than the previous ones follow, and Abraham returns to Bersabee, his dwelling-place in the south country. He must have returned from here to Hebron, because Sara died at Kirjath-Arbe, i.e., Hebron, where she was buried in the sepulchral cave of Machpelah. Isaac is then married to Rebecca, and Abraham himself marries Cetura, whose children were, however, sent away, as Ismael had been banished. Finally, Abraham died at the age of 175 years, and was buried in the cave of Machpelah.

6. Rebecca, who had at first been barren, now gave birth to twins, Esau and Jacob. The manner in which Esau sold his primogeniture to Jacob is too well known to need further description. A famine soon forced Isaac to go, like his father, to Gerara; God warned him not to proceed into the land of Egypt, and renewed at the same time the Messianic blessing which he had repeatedly imparted to Abraham (xxvi. 2 ff.). Finally, Jacob obtained his father's blessing fraudulently.

7. Esau's wrath is stirred up on account of Jacob's fraud; he is determined to kill his brother after their father's death. Rebecca, therefore, sends Jacob with Isaac's consent to Haran, in order to marry a wife of his own race. On the way thither God appears to him in his

vision of the mysterious ladder at Bethel, and repeats the patriarchal Messianic promises (Gen. xxviii. 14).

**2. MESSIANIC CHARACTER OF THE PROPHECIES.**—1. Sacred Scripture supposes this in many passages: Gen. xlix. 10; Ps. ii. 8; xxi. (xxii.) 27-31; lxxi. (lxxii.) 8-11, 17, 19; xev. (xevi.) 3, 7-10; xevii. (xeviii.) 2, 3; Is. ii. 2-4; ix. 1-6; xi. 10; xlii. 1, 6, 7; xlix. 6; Joel iii. 1, 2; Jer. iii. 17; Agg. ii. 7; Mal. i. 11; Zach. xiv. 16-19; Gal. iii. 14; Acts jii. 25, 26; xiii. 32; Luke i. 55, 73; Rom. iv. 16, 18; Jo. iv. 22.

2. The Fathers of the Church are unanimous in explaining the patriarchal promises as referring to the Messiah (cf. Reinke).

3. The fulfilment of the prophecy warrants us in taking the promises as referring to Christ.

4. The ancient Synagogue too explained the patriarchal promises as referring to the Messiah. We have testimony of this in Ecclus. xlv. 22 (Vulg. 24, 25); Onkelos too bears witness for us, since he translates the Divine promise: "they shall be blessed on account of thee and of thy sons." Ps. Jonathan: "They shall be blessed through thy merit and the merit of thy sons." In Bemid. R. (sect. 2, fol. 184, 4) there is a rather curious explanation of Gen. xxii. 18: "God compares the Israelites to the dust. But what are its qualities? If there were no dust, man could not exist; there would be neither trees nor fruits. In the same manner, if there were no Israelites, the world could not exist, as is written in Gen. xxii. 18: And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed. In this world (i.e., in the O.T.) God compares them to the dust; but at the time of the Messiah they will be like the sand on the sea-shore. What is the quality of the sand? It dulls the teeth. Thus will the Israelites at the time of the Messiah grind up all the Gentiles, as it is written (Num. xxiv. 19): Out of Jacob shall he come that shall rule. And again Ezechiel says: And I will lay my vengeance upon Edom by the hand of my people Israel. Another reason why the Is.

raelites are compared to the sand is this: If one throws a handful of sand into the dough or the food, no one can eat of it, because he would dull his teeth: thus it is with the Israelites. Whoever plunders or robs them dulls his teeth for the future world, as is written in Is. xxiv. 23. And the moon shall blush, and the sun shall be ashamed, when the Lord of hosts shall reign in Mount Sion, and in Jerusalem, and shall be glorified in the sight of his ancients."

GEN. XII. 1-9.

And the<sup>1</sup> Lord said to Abram: "Go forth out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and out of thy father's house, and come into the land which I shall show thee. And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and magnify thy name, and thou shalt be blessed. And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse them that curse thee, and in thee shall all the<sup>2</sup> kindreds of the earth be blessed."

<sup>1</sup> **The Lord said to Abraham.** If we summarize the various promises made to the patriarchs, we find that God grants them five distinct blessings: 1. They shall have a numerous posterity; 2. they will always enjoy God's special protection; 3. they are to possess the land of Chanaan for a long time; 4. they will be victorious over all their enemies; 5. through them and through their seed blessing shall come to all the tribes of the earth. It is plain that the fifth promise is the one that concerns us above all; the first four will be explained in so far only as they shed light on the last.

In the fifth blessing there are again four special points that need explanation: 1. The subject of the blessing must be determined; 2. the precise meaning of the Hebrew phrase "shall be blessed" must be investigated; 3. the instrument through which the blessing is to descend on the nations of the earth must be described; 4. the blessing itself, its nature and purpose, must be accurately defined.

<sup>2</sup> **All the kindreds of the earth.** 1. The extent of the blessing promised to Abraham and his seed is limited by some authors to the inhabitants of Chanaan. Bertholdt (*De ortu theologiæ veter.*) follows the view of Ammon (*Christologie*), and upholds the limited extent of God's blessing promised to the patriarchs: "Abrahamo, Isaaco et Jacobo facta erat a deo spes, fore ut reliquæ gentes terræ Canaanis (*Hadamuh' ha-arez' goyey' mishpechoth*) posterorum suorum potestati se subiicerent atque sic honores et beneficia populis fœdere cum aliis iunctis ex vulgari consuetudine concessa in se conferrent." Baumgarten-Crusius (*Biblioth. theolog.* p. 368) modifies the above opinion; he supposes that the descendants of Abraham will possess the whole earth, and that its inhabitants will be blessed by them, because they will be subject to their rule.

So Abram went out as the Lord had commanded him, and Lot went with him : Abram was seventy-five years old when he went forth from Haran. And he took Sarai his wife, and Lot his brother's son, and all the substance which they had gathered, and the souls which they had gotten in Haran, and they went out to go into the land of Chanaan. And when they were come into it, Abram passed through the country unto the place of Sichem, as far as the noble vale : now the Chanaanite was at that time in the land. And the Lord appeared to Abram, and said to him : "To thy seed will I give this land." And he built there an altar to the Lord, who had appeared to him. And passing on from thence to a mountain, that was on the east-side of Bethel, he there pitched his tent, having Bethel on the west and Hai on the east : he built there also an altar to the Lord, and called upon his name. And Abram went forward going, and proceeding on to the south.

#### GEN. XVII. 1-9.

And after he began to be ninety and nine years old, the Lord appeared to him, and he said unto him: "I am the Almighty God ;

*a.* Deferring the answer to this opinion till we come to consider the nature of Abraham's blessing, we must here state that the restriction of Erets and Adamah to the land of Chanaan, and of Goyim and Mishpechoth to the Chanaanites is entirely arbitrary, since no one of the parallel texts requires such a limitation; on the contrary, they tend to show that these comprehensive expressions must be received in their unrestricted signification. *b.* Besides, the Jewish tradition favors the unlimited meaning of the words in question, as is seen from all those passages in Scripture where the extension of the Messianic salvation is announced to all the heathen nations. Bertholdt confesses that at the time of David and Solomon such an unlimited interpretation was the commonly received one, but he seeks to evade the evident inference by contending that such an interpretation proceeded from an ignorance of "historical hermeneutics." *c.* Finally, it is not easy to see how God could have promised temporal blessing to all the Chanaanites through Abraham, since in Gen. xv. 18 it is expressly promised that the descendants of Abraham are to possess the whole of Palestine and to have dominion over all its tribes. Even the sentence of extermination is plainly alluded to in the words that the iniquity of the Amorrites is not yet full (xv. 16). For the Amorrites undoubtedly stand as a part for the whole. We must therefore conclude that if Moses had intended to represent only the Chanaanites as the subjects of the promised blessing, he would have indicated such a limited meaning of Erets as he always does when the limitation is not altogether clear from the context.



walk before me and be perfect. And I will make my covenant between me and thee, and I will multiply thee exceedingly." Abram fell flat on his face. And God said to him: "I am, and my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of many nations. Neither shall thy name be called any more Abram, but thou shalt be called Abraham, because I have made thee a father of many nations. And I will make thee increase exceedingly, and I will make nations of thee, and kings shall come out of thee. And I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and between thy seed after thee in their generation, by a perpetual covenant, to be a God to thee and to thy seed after thee. And I will give to thee and to thy seed the land of thy sojournment, all the land of Chanaan for a perpetual possession, and I will be their God."

GEN. XVIII. 17-19.

And the Lord said, "Can I hide from Abraham what I am about to do, seeing he shall become a great and mighty nation, and in him all the nations of the earth<sup>3</sup> shall be blessed? For I

<sup>3</sup> **Shall be blessed.** 2. The second point that needs investigation is the precise meaning of the phrase "shall be blessed." All the difficulty arises from the fact that in the Hebrew text the Niphal form, "nibrekhū" is used in Gen. xii. 3; xviii. 18; xxviii. 14, while the Hithpael form is employed in the other two parallel passages (Gen. xxii. 18 and xxvi. 4). Hence the question: must the phrase be translated as if the verb were passive, which is the ordinary meaning of the Niphal, or must we translate it as a reflexive, which is the ordinary meaning of the Hithpael? Authors who have considered this question give as many different answers as can be reasonably supported.

1. The first class of commentators contends that the Hithpael in the two parallel passages has a passive not a reflexive meaning. This interpretation is defended by such authorities as Patrizi, Jahn, Bade, de Wette, von Bohlen, Lamy. The last-named writer gives the following reasons for his opinion: *a.* Hithpael is always a passive form in Syriac. *b.* Hithbarekhu is translated as a passive in Is. lxxv. 16 and Ps. lxxi. (lxxii.) 17. *c.* The Septuagint, the Vulgate, the Syriac version, the paraphrase of Onkelos, translate "Hithbarekhu" of the two passages here in question as a passive.

Still, it must be noted that the Hithpael of the verb "barakh" occurs only six times in the Hebrew text of the Old Testament: in the two passages above mentioned, in the two passages cited by Lamy, in Deut. xxix. 18, and in Jer. iv. 2. The last passage reads according to the Hebrew text: "The nations shall bless themselves in him, and in him shall they glory." The reflexive meaning seems to be required in the context. As to Deut. xxix. 18 (Vulg. 19),

know that he will command his children and his household after him to keep the way of the Lord, and do judgment and justice, the reflexive meaning is still more clearly required: "And it came to pass, when he heareth the words of this oath, that he bless himself in his heart, saying, I shall have peace, though I walk in the stubbornness of my heart." The passive meaning is here evidently excluded by the context. The passage from *Is. lxx. 16*, which Lamy translates as having the verb in the passive voice, is equally well rendered with the verb in the reflexive sense, the ordinary signification of *Hithpael*: "So that he who blesseth himself in the earth shall bless himself in the God of truth." Unless weighty reasons can be advanced for understanding the *Hithpael* in the passive sense in this passage, its ordinary signification should not be abandoned. The verse cited by Lamy from *Ps. lxxi. (lxxii.) 17* seems at first to require an active rather than a reflexive verb. But the active meaning of the verb "*Yithbarekhu*" is excluded by the preposition which follows it. Hence the reflexive signification of the verb, "men shall bless themselves in him," is at least as proper as the passive, "men shall be blessed in him." Keeping in mind then this result of our investigation concerning the *Hithpael* of "*barakh*," it is antecedently probable that the two passages in the present prophecy have a reflexive rather than a passive meaning. Indeed, the passive meaning of the *Hithpael* in question seems to be a mere Aramaic idiom.

*B.* Another class of commentators has therefore thought fit to translate not only the *Hithpael* of "*barakh*" in the two prophetic passages as reflexive, but also the *Niphal* in their three parallel verbs. This interpretation is found in the works of writers like Delitzsch, Gesenius, De Wette (latterly), Ewald, Knobel, Dillmann, and others of no small authority. Their reasons are especially the following two: *a.* The *Hithpael* of "*barakh*" has a reflexive meaning in the passages parallel to our prophecy. But the parallelism is so minute that the voice of the verb cannot be changed. Hence the *Niphal* in our three prophetic passages must have its primitive reflexive meaning. *b.* Again, there is another form of the verb "*barakh*," which has certainly the passive sense; for its *Pual* occurs in this signification in *Num. xxii. 6* and *Ps. xxxvi. (xxxvii.) 22*. Hence we must suppose that the *Niphal* of "*barakh*" retains its original reflexive meaning. The argument for the passive meaning taken from the *LXX.* is said to prove nothing, and in confirmation of this we are directed to *Eccles. xlv. 21*.

But if we weigh the arguments brought for the reflexive meaning of the *Niphal* we must confess that they are not conclusive. *a.* The second one, for instance, may be easily retorted in this way: The reflexive meaning of the verb "*barakh*" is expressed by the *Hithpael*, as all the six passages prove which have been quoted in the preceding paragraph. Hence, the *Niphal* of the verb which occurs in our prophecy must have its ordinary passive meaning. *b.* Again, as to the parallelism, it is generally acknowledged that parallel members do not necessarily express their similar ideas in precisely the same manner. Hence, this alone cannot be advanced as an argument for the reflexive rather than the passive meaning of a verb.

that for Abraham's sake the Lord may bring to effect all the things he hath spoken unto him."

GEN. XXII. 16-18.

By my own self have I sworn, saith the Lord, because thou hast done this thing, and hast not spared thy only-begotten son for my sake : I will bless thee, and I will multiply thy seed as the stars of heaven, and as the sand that is by the sea-shore, thy seed shall possess the gates of their enemies, and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed, because thou hast obeyed my voice.

GEN. XXVI. 1-5.

And when a famine came in the land, after that barrenness which had happened in the days of Abraham, Isaac went to Abimelech, king of the Palestines, to Gerara. And the Lord appeared to him, and said: "Go not down into Egypt, but stay in the land that I shall tell thee, and sojourn in it, and I will be with thee, and will bless thee, for to thee and to thy seed I will give all these countries, to fulfil the oath which I swore to Abraham thy father. And I will multiply thy seed like the stars of heaven, and I will give to thy posterity all these countries, and in thy "

*C.* The advocates of a third interpretation contend that the Niphal of "barakh" should be taken in its ordinary passive meaning, and the Hithpael of the same verb in its reflexive signification. The commentators who adhere to this opinion are Hengstenberg, Reinke, Corluy, Kimchi, Aben-Ezra, and others. *a.* The reasons given by these authors are for the most part those which are advanced by the commentators who hold either of the two preceding opinions. *b.* Besides, the ordinary meaning of the Niphal and the Hithpael forms is kept intact, so that no further explanation for either acceptation is needed.

<sup>4</sup> *In thee—In him—In thy seed.* 3. In the third place the instrument through which the blessing is to come to the human race must be determined. The words of Scripture describe the instrument by the words "in thee" (xii. 3), "in him" (xviii. 18), "in thy seed" (xxii. 17), "in thy seed" (xxvi. 4), "in thee and thy seed" (xxviii. 14). But before we speak of the real meaning of these phrases, we must reject two interpretations of them which do not express the full sense of the promise.

*a.* Eckermann (Theolog. Beitr. ii. 3, p. 40), Le Clerc, Jarchi, and other Jewish commentators translate the Hebrew preposition by "as" instead of "in." Le Clerc explains the interpretation thus: The blessings of most oriental people will be contained in the following words: "May God bless thee as he has blessed Abraham." Hence

seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed, because Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my precepts and commandments, and observed my ceremonies and laws."

the whole passage now under consideration ought to be translated: "All the nations of the earth will greet or bless each other: Prosper as Abraham." The fault of this interpretation is evident even from the fact that the Hithpael of "barakh" does not mean "to wish one another prosperity," but "to regard one's self as blessed or happy, to promise one's self prosperity."

b. Another interpretation of the passage which also supposes that the preposition must be rendered by "as" instead of "in" is given by St. Chrysostom, Theophylactus, Ecumenius, St. Augustine. They translate: "All the nations shall be blessed as thou art blessed." It is true that the Hebrew preposition used in this passage is rendered in the sense of "as" in Ps. xlv. 4; xxxvii. 20; cxii. 4; Os. x. 15; but this meaning of the preposition has seemed so unnatural to the Massoretic writers that they have adopted a different reading in three of the passages cited. Besides, the Messianic sense of the passage in question is destroyed by such a rendering, while it agrees most beautifully with the common meaning of the Hebrew preposition.

c. Others again sin by excess, because they take the Hebrew preposition  $\text{ב}$  as signifying "through," "on account of," "through the merits of." It is safer to regard the preposition as indicating instrumentality in general, without determining the nature of the mediatorship. Or, if a definite way must be determined, "in thee" according to Scripture language means "in as far as thou representest thy offspring" (cf. Gen. ix. 1; xii. 2; xvii. 2; xviii. 18; xxvi. 3).

d. The clause "in thy seed," contained in the promise given to the patriarchs, is explained in different ways: 1. The seed is Christ alone (Bade, etc.) Reasons:  $\alpha$ . Ps. lxxi. (lxxii.) 17; Luke i. 73, 72; Jo. viii. 56; Acts iii. 24-26; iv. 11; Gal. iii. 6-9, 14-16;  $\beta$ . The translation of the Chaldee paraphrase thus limits the meaning of seed;  $\gamma$ . The Jews have excluded themselves from the participation in the Messianic blessing, and can therefore be in no way said to have been instrumental in procuring the same to others. 2. Other authors are of opinion that the patriarchal seed in which all nations will be blessed includes Christ and all the faithful Israelites (Corluy, Hengst, Reinke). The other descendants of the patriarchs are excluded by Rom. iv. 12 (cf. Gal. iii. 7; Rom. ix. 6-10). Reasons:  $\alpha$ . In Gen. xxii. 17 the seed must certainly be taken collectively; therefore also in the following verse (cf. Gen. xxvi. 4 and xxviii. 14).  $\beta$ . Jo. iv. 22, salvation is said to come from the Jews;  $\gamma$ . Rom. xi. 17, 18, 24, considers the wild olive branches in the same light;  $\delta$ . Is. ii. 3, the law will go out from Sion and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem;  $\epsilon$ . The apostles and the first Christians were chosen from among the Jews; cf. Acts xiii. 46; Rom. iii. 2;  $\zeta$ . The Chaldee paraphrase always speaks of "thy sons."

It is only the Latin translation of the paraphrase that has the singular number in this text, and has thus given the patrons of the above view an apparent argument for their position. As to the Jews,

GEN. XXVIII. 10-15.

But Jacob being departed from Bersabee, went on to Haran. And when he was come to a certain place, and would rest in it after sunset, he took of the stones that lay there, and putting under his head, slept in the same place. And he saw in his sleep a ladder standing upon the earth, and the top thereof touching heaven, the angels also of God ascending and descending by it, and the Lord leaning upon the ladder saying to him: "I am the Lord God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac: the land wherein thou sleepest I will give to thee and to thy seed. And thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth: thou shalt spread abroad to the west and to the east, and to the north, and to the south, and in thee and thy seed all <sup>6</sup> the tribes of the earth shall be blessed. And I will be thy keeper whither soever thou goest, and will bring thee back into this land: neither will I leave thee till I shall have accomplished all that I have said."

only the unfaithful ones have excluded themselves from the Messianic blessing. St. Paul in Gal. iii. 6-9 and 14-16 argues from the mystical body of Christ, which includes all the faithful (cf. Gal. iii. 29). Ps. lxxi. (lxxii.) 17; Jo. viii. 56; Acts iii. 25, 26 and iv. 11 treat of the primary and principal source of the Messianic blessing, but not of the adequate source. The oath mentioned in Luke i. 72, 73 has been fulfilled because the seed of the patriarchs has become a source of blessing through the merits of Christ.

<sup>5</sup> Shall be blessed. 4. In the fourth place, we must investigate the nature of the blessing which has come to all the nations of the earth through the seed of the patriarchs. The full meaning intended by the Holy Ghost may be gathered from divers texts of the New Testament: He promises the incarnation of the Son of God (Jo. iii. 16); the death of Christ (Rom. v. 6-10); the remission of sins (Luke xxiv. 47; I. Jo. ii. 12); all the riches of grace (Eph. i. 3, 6); the adoptive sonship of God (Jo. i. 12; Rom. viii. 15-17); the indwelling of the Holy Ghost (Rom. v. 5; viii. 15, 16, 26; I. Cor. iii. 16); the right to a heavenly inheritance (Rom. viii. 17); a participation of the divine nature which was to begin in this life (II. Pet. i. 4); the beatific vision, life eternal, etc. (I. Cor. xiii. 12; Rom. vi. 22; viii. 19-23; I. Jo. iii. 2). Though the Holy Ghost intended all these blessings in the prophecies, it does not follow that all had to be understood at once.



## COROLLARIES.

**1. PATRIARCHAL HOPE.**—As to the nature of the Messianic salvation which the patriarchs must have inferred from these promises, we may safely hold that: *a.* They must have understood the promises of spiritual blessings, because they were represented as a reward of Abraham's faith and obedience; God himself mentions the preservation of the true religious worship as one particular blessing (Gen. xviii. 19), and the emphasis which he lays on the promises would hardly be justified if they referred to natural blessings alone. *b.* When, how, and through which particular members of their offspring these blessings would be realized, and to which particular nations they were to extend, and finally in how far the offspring of the patriarchs would be instrumental in the blessing of the nations,—all these points were so many mysteries for the recipients of the prophetic promises, unless their minds were especially enlightened (cf. Jo. viii. 55 f.).

**2. RELATION OF THE PATRIARCHS TO THE PROPHECIES.**—It is of interest to consider the different relations which the three patriarchs hold in regard to this prophetic series. Abraham is promised twice that *in him* and once that *in his seed* all the nations of the earth will be blessed; Isaac obtains the promise that *in his seed* the national blessing will be given to the world; Jacob finally is promised that *in him* and *in his seed* the same blessing will be given. Cajetan draws attention to the fact that while Abraham and Jacob figure personally as mediators of the blessing, in Isaac's case only his seed is mentioned as the medium. The reason given for this difference of relation is sought by the same theologian in the fact that Abraham is the father of faith, Jacob is the father of the chosen people, while Isaac is father of Esau too, in whom we may see the representative of the future schisms.

Whatever truth there may be in this reasoning, it is cer-



tain that Isaac holds a peculiar position in Jewish legends. He is represented as an angel made before the world (Orig. in Jo. ii. 25); as one of the three men in whom human sinfulness has no place, and as one of the six over whom the angel of death has no power (Eisenmenger, *Entd. Jud. i.* 343, 864). He is said to have been instructed in divine knowledge by Sem (Jarchi, *Gen. xxv.*), and evening prayer is connected with him (*Gen. xxiv. 63*), as morning prayer with Abraham (*Gen. xix. 27*) and night prayer with Jacob (*Gen. xxviii. 11*; Eisenmenger, *Entd. Jud. i.* 473).

The Arabian traditions too preserved in the Koran represent Isaac as a model of religion, as a just man inspired by grace to do many good works, as a man of prayer and of almsgiving (c. xxi.), as endowed with the divine gifts of prophecy, of children and of wealth (c. xix.). Isaac's promise and offering are also mentioned (c. xi. 38).

The following may serve as models of several fanciful representations assigned to the patriarchs by some modern writers. A. Jukes (*Types of Gen.*) regards Adam as representing human nature; Cain is the type of the carnal mind, Abel of the spiritual, Noe of regeneration, Abraham of faith, Isaac of sonship, Jacob of service, Joseph of suffering or glory. Ewald (*Gesch. i.* 387-400) views the whole patriarchal family as a typical group of twelve members. *a.* Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are three fathers, representing active power, quiet enjoyment, success after struggles; they may be compared to Agamemnon, Achilles, and Ulysses among the Greeks, to Anchises, Æneas, and Ascanius among the Trojans, and to Romulus, Remus, and Numa among the Romans; *b.* Sara and Agar represent the mother and mistress of the household; *c.* Isaac represents the child; *d.* Isaac with Rebecca typifies wedlock; *e.* Lia and Rachel show the plurality of coequal wives; *f.* Debbora is the nurse (cf. Anna and Caieta, *Æn. iv.* 654; vii. 1). *g.* Eliezer represents the steward whose office is compared with that of the messenger of the Olympic deities.

Placing these theories among the works of fancy, where

they belong, we must finally state the typical character given to the patriarchal history from the earliest times of ecclesiastical literature. It is true that the typical character of Isaac is barely referred to in the New Testament; but Philo and all the interpreters who are influenced by the Alexandrian philosophy draw out the typical view with minute particularity. Passing over these brilliant rather than solid explanations, we find that Clement of Rome (c. 31) sees in Isaac an example of faith in God; Tertullian, pattern of monogamy and of Christ bearing the cross; Clement of Alexandria finds allegorical meanings in Isaac's dealings with Abimeleeh and in his intended immolation; Origen, Augustine, and Christian interpreters generally explain Isaac's immolation as representing Christ's death on the cross; Rhabanus Maurus has drawn out this figure in all its particulars.

## CHAPTER V.

THE MESSIAS IS THE SON OF JACOB. NUM. xxiv. 15-19.

### INTRODUCTION.

**1. TIME AND OCCASION OF THE PROPHECY.**—In the first month of the fortieth year after their leaving Egypt, the Israelites encamped for the second time in Cades (Num. xx.). Here Mary, the sister of Moses, died; here too the people again murmured against the Lord by reason of a want of water, and here Moses and Aaron committed the sin of diffidence in the help of God. Since Moses knew that they could hardly expect to enter Palestine from the south side on account of the strongly fortified towns, he led the people around towards the east, sending messengers from Cades to the kings of Edom and Moab, in order to obtain a free passage through their territories. Permission being refused, the territories of these princes had to be avoided, and thus it was that Israel came to Mount Hor. Here Aaron died; then King Arad (Num. xxi.), who had at first gained some advantages over Israel, was vanquished; but on their way south, which had to be taken in order to pass around Edom, the Israelites again murmured and were punished by the fiery serpents. Finally, the people advanced along the eastern boarder of Edom northward, till they reached the Arnon. When Sehon, king of the Amorrites, refused them a free passage through his territory to the Jordan, they conquered his whole kingdom from the Arnon to the Jeboc; then Og, the king of Basan, was put to death, and his kingdom with its sixty fortified cities taken. Next the Israelites turned again southward,

and encamped in the fields of Moab, across Jordan, opposite Jericho (Num. xxii. 1 ff.).

Balac, the king of Moab, was frightened, made an alliance with the Midianites, and being not yet confident enough in their combined forces, Balac sent to Balaam, the son of Beor, who lived in the land of the Ammonites, requesting him to come and curse Israel. After the well-known remonstrances on the part of God, the appearance of the angel, and the talking of Balaam's ass, the soothsayer finally reaches the camp of Balac, where he is received with all possible splendor. First the prophet is led to the Baal heights (Num. xxii. 41; xxiii.), on the eastern part of Mount Abarim, where he repeats the blessing of Abraham in spite of the seven altars and the seven burnt-offerings prepared by Balac. Balaam is now made to ascend the summit of Phasga (Num. xxiii. 13 ff.), where he repeats, in spite of the same bountiful sacrifices, the blessing of Juda and the covenant blessing of Horeb. The third time Balac and Balaam ascend Phogor (Num. xxiii. 27 ff.), where the prophet repeats the combined blessings of Abraham and Jacob. Finally, before leaving Balac, Balaam informs him of the future of Israel (Num. xxiv. 14 ff.). They shall triumph over Edom and Moab; then the fate of the Amalecites (l. c. 20), the Ginites (l. c. 21, 22), and the Assyrians (l. c. 23, 24) is announced.

**2. CHARACTER OF THE PROPHET.**—No doubt Balaam was a Gentile soothsayer, who had, however, become acquainted with the history of Israel and with their true God, Jehovah, to whom he had consecrated himself. The motives of his service may have been like the motives of Simon Magnus, since he seems to have been under the sway of avarice in the latter course of his history. He must have known the truth concerning the immortality of the soul and the future retribution; why else should he have prayed: "Let my soul die the death of the just, and my last end be like to them"? (Num. xxiii. 10.) After being dismissed by Balac, Balaam may have gone over to Moses

in order to reveal to him the prophecies enounced with the view of obtaining from the Hebrews the rich rewards which he had lost at the court of the Moabite king. Not obtaining what he desired he gave the wicked advice to the Madianites of enticing the Hebrews into sin, and thus rendering them odious to Jehovah (cf. Num. xxxi. 8, 16; xxvi. 1-3; Apoc. ii. 14). He was slain among the Madianites by the avenging hands of Hebrews.

**3. AUTHORSHIP OF THE PROPHECY.**—It is not certain, as Driver says (Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, 1892, p. 62), whether Num. xxiii. and xxiv. belong to J or E, or whether they are the work of the compiler, who has made use of both sources. Critics differ, the author continues, and it is wise to leave the question undetermined. Delitzsch (Messianic Prophecies in Historical Succession, translated by S. I. Curtiss, New York, 1891, p. 65) is a little more determined: "We admit that the narrative, as it lies before us, is combined out of several sources that may be clearly distinguished, and that the historical element, as it survived in the 'sage,' has been reproduced, not without literary co-operation, but without doubting the fact that the heathen sorcerer, contrary to his natural disposition, became a prophet of Yahweh, and that he received an insight into the future of Israel, whose significance only has its counterpart in the second part of the Book of Zechariah and the Book of Daniel." Provided the Mosaic and inspired authorship of the prophecy in its present form is saved, we may grant any manner of composition.

**4. UNCHRISTIAN APPLICATIONS OF THE PROPHECY.**—*a.* Vershuir (Bibliotheca Brem. nova class. iii. 1, pp. 1-80) denies the relation of Balaam's prophecy to the Messiah in any sense, and regards it as applying alike to David, John Hyrcanus, and Alexander Jannæus. The seventeenth verse he refers to the first two, the nineteenth verse to the last. *b.* Michaelis and Dathe too have denied the Messianic character of the prophecy, applying it to David alone. *c.* De

Wette endeavors to prove from this prophecy the fictitious nature of the whole story and the spuriousness of the Pentateuch.

**5. MESSIANIC CHARACTER OF BALAAM'S PROPHECY.**—1. Jewish tradition looks upon the passage as Messianic. The Targum Onkelos reads: "When a mighty king of Jacob's house will reign, and the Messiah will be magnified." The Targum Jonathan has a similar paraphrase: "When there shall reign a strong king of the house of Jacob, and the Messiah shall be anointed, and a strong sceptre shall come from Israel. . . ." Rabbi Simeon, the son of Yochai, taught: "Rabbi Akiba, my teacher, explained: There shall come a star of Jacob, Cosiba comes of Jacob; for when he saw Bar Cosiba, he exclaimed: This is the Messiah" (cf. Jerusalem Taanith, fol. 68, col. 4). A similar testimony is found in Debarim Rabba (sec. 1): "The Israelites said to God: How long shall we be in bondage? He replied: Till the day comes of which it is said: 'There shall come a star out of Jacob.'" In the Pesikta Sotarta (fol. 58, col. 1) we read: "Our Rabbis have a tradition that in the week in which the Messiah will be born there will be a bright star in the east, which is the star of the Messiah." In Shemoth Rabba (sect. 30, fol. 129, 1) we read the following passage: "Parable of a man who went into a strange country and heard that a public trial was to be held. He asked a great talker when the trial would be held. His answer was: It is still far off. The man asked another the same question, and the answer was: It will take place very soon. The man said: I have asked the great talker, and he said it would not take place for some time. The other answered: You know that he is a talker, and do you think that he would like the trial to take place soon, not knowing whether his own case will be tried, and he will be condemned? Thus the Israelites asked Balaam: When will the redemption come? He answered (Num. xxiv. 17): I shall see him, but not now; I shall behold him, but not near. The Holy Blessed God said: Do you not know that



Balaam will go down into hell, and that he would prefer my salvation should not come?" Bechai (fol. 180, 4) reads: "I shall see him, but not now, must be understood of David; I shall behold him, but not near, of the king Messias; a star shall rise out of Jacob, of David; a sceptre shall spring up from Israel, of king Messias; and shall strike the chiefs of Moab, of David (III. Kings viii. 2); and shall waste all the children of Seth, of the Messias (Ps. lxxii. 18); he shall possess Idumea, of David (III. Kings viii. 14); but Israel shall do manfully, of the Messias (Abdias, 21)." Another testimony we find in Pesikta Sotarta (fol. 58, 2): "At that time they shall blow a great trumpet, and then shall be fulfilled what is written, Num. xxiv. 17: A star shall rise out of Jacob." Sohar chadaseh (fol. 44, 2) reads thus: "I shall see him, refers to the redemption which will be the fourth; but not now, but in the latter days. The world has six days. On the fourth, the heavenly lights shall be taken away and cease, i.e., the sun, the moon, and the stars shall be hidden on that day, as they were in the creation." It may be noticed in passing that the Messianic times are here placed into the fourth millennium, or after the first three thousand years. The Sohar (Num. fol. 85, col. 340) has the following remarks about Num. xxiv. 17: "God has decreed to build up Jerusalem, and to show a star which shines besides seventy other stars, and out of which proceed seventy satellites, and seventy other stars will be taken with the same. This star is the Messias; his satellites are the apostles and the dignitaries of the Church." A little later the same book continues: "At the time of the star's appearance, the earth will tremble for forty-five miles around the place where the Temple is standing. And there shall be opened a cavern under the ground out of which shall come forth a fire that will set the earth on fire. The heavenly bird too will come forth out of the cavern, to whom empire is given, and the nations of the earth will be gathered under his sway. And the king Messias will appear in the whole

world, and will take vengeance on the Edomites, and set the land of Seir on fire." See also Sohar, fol. 58, 1; fol. 44, 4; Tikkune Sohar, c. 37; Pesikta Sotarta, fol. 58, 1; Pesikta Rabbathi, fol. 20, 4.

2. The Messianic character of the prophecy uttered by Balaam may be also recognized from the very context of the passage. For according to the verse immediately preceding the prophecy, Balaam expressly says that it regards the "latter days." Now this phrase "latter days" is generally used of the Messianic times; (cf. Gen. xlix. 1; Deut. iv. 30; Jer. xlvi. 47; Is. ii. 2, etc.).

3. Then again the contents of the prophecy point to the Messianic fulfilment. *a.* The victories of David, no doubt, were a partial fulfilment of Balaam's prediction, and the language in which they are reported seems to point out their reference to the present prophecy (cf. II. Kings viii. 2, 13, 14; III. Kings xi. 15, 1; Ps. lix. (lx.) 8.) On the other hand, David's victories do not exhaust Balaam's predictions, since they do not amount to a permanent conquest of Moab and Edom.

*b.* The Moabite stone informs us that the Moabites were again subdued by Omri, and kept in subjection for forty years. Then followed the successful revolt of Mesha (IV. Kings i. 1; iii. 4, 5), the new victory over the Moabites by Joram (IV. Kings iii. 21), their offensive war against Juda in the reign of Joas (IV. Kings xiii. 20), and their final subjection by John Hyrcanus, B.C. 129.

*c.* As to the Edomites, they revolted under Solomon (III. Kings xi. 14), and more successfully under Joram (IV. Kings viii. 20), were defeated under Amasias (IV. Kings xiv. 7), and again under Ozias (IV. Kings xiv. 22), but not completely subjugated, so that in the reign of Achaz they invaded Juda (II. Paral. xxviii. 17).

*d.* Accordingly, we find that the prophets who lived centuries after David took up his prophecies concerning the Moabites and the Edomites, thus showing evidently that they had not been accomplished in the time of David. As

to Moab, see Is. xv.; xvi. 1-5; xxv. 20 ff.; Amos ii. 1; Sophon. ii. 8 ff.; as to Edom, see Is. xxxiv. 5 ff.; lxiii. 1-6; Jer. xlix. 7 ff.; Lam. iv. 21, 22; Ezech. xxv. 12; Amos ix. 11, 12; Abdias, 17 ff.; both nations are referred to in Is. xi. 14.

*e.* If it is evident that the prophecy has not been fully accomplished by any of the Jewish kings, it is also certain that the Moabites and the Edomites are common types in the prophetic writings signifying in general all the enemies of the kingdom of God, as they were the bitterest foes of the theocracy. Thus it is plain that the final overthrow of all those who oppose the kingdom of God is predicted by the prophet, and this final defeat is to be inflicted by the star that shall rise out of Jacob, and by the ruler who shall come out of Israel.

4. The fact that the last Jewish rebel who rose in the reign of Hadrian took the name Bar-cohab, i.e., Son of a star, proves the two propositions laid down in the preceding number: that the Jews of that period regarded the present prophecy as still unfulfilled, though Moab had long before vanished from history, and that the actual accomplishment of the prediction was expected in Messianic times. Hence when Bar-cohab proved to be a failure, the disappointed Jews called him Bar-coziba, i.e., Son of a falsehood. Why should the false Messiah have been called thus in reference to his former name Bar-cohab if this had not been regarded as the name of the true Messiah?

5. If it be urged against us that Balaam could not have understood his prophecy, we may freely grant this premise, but we deny the inference drawn from it. Prophets do not necessarily understand the full import of their prophetic predictions (cf. I. Pet. i. 11); and if this be true of the good and faithful prophets of the Lord, why could it not happen in the case of a Gentile whose heart was perverted, and whose dominant passion seems to have been that of the traitor apostle Judas?

6. Finally, the Fathers of the Church and Christian tra-

dition have never given any other than a Messianic interpretation to Balaam's prophecy (cf. Tübing. Quartalsch., 1844, p. 474; 1860, p. 654; 1872, p. 625 ff.; Reinke, Beiträge, vol. 4).

NUM. XXIV. 15-19.

Balaam <sup>1</sup> the son of Beor hath said,  
 The man whose eye is stopped up <sup>2</sup> hath said,  
 The hearer of the words of God hath said,  
 Who knoweth the doctrine of the highest  
 And seeth the visions of the Almighty,  
 Who <sup>3</sup> falling hath his eyes opened.  
 I shall see him, but not now,  
 I shall behold him, but not near.  
 A <sup>4</sup> star shall rise out of Jacob,

<sup>1</sup> **Metre.** Both Bickell and Gietmann agree that the present passage belongs to the heptasyllabic kind of verse; the movement is iambic.

<sup>2</sup> **Stopped up.** The Hebrew word thus rendered occurs only here and in the parallel passage (Num. xxiv. 3), and hence it has been variously interpreted. 1. Gesenius, De Wette, Hupfeld, Keil, Hengstenberg, etc., translate the word as the Vulgate does by "closed" or "stopped up." If this rendering be accepted, there is again a two-fold way of explaining the word: *a.* Balaam's eyes were closed, as far as the correction of his error was concerned (Rhaban. Maur.); *b.* Balaam's bodily eyes were closed, because, being in the ecstatic state, he was bereft of the use of his senses (a Lapidé, Trochon, etc.). 2. The LXX., Saad, Maurer, Fürst, Wogue, Knobel, etc., translate the phrase "the man whose eyes are open." They appeal especially to the Mishna (Abod. Sar. c. v.), where the verb used in the present passage signifies the unstopping of a wine-jar. They thus put an antithesis between Balaam's being in a trance and having his eyes open. The former rendering is much better suited to the context, and is also supported by better authority.

<sup>3</sup> **Who falling.** The falling mentioned in this passage seems to have been the condition under which the inward opening of Balaam's eyes took place. It indicates rather the force of the divine revelation overpowering the seer than his vision of the divine glory (cf. Dan. viii. 17; Apoc. i. 17). We find hardly any instance of such a falling in the case of God's faithful prophets; in the case of St. Paul and of Balaam it shows that God's word had to overcome a stubborn human will.

<sup>4</sup> **A star.** Explanations: 1. The star which appeared at the birth of Christ is foretold (Orig. c. Celsum, i. 12, 2). This is hardly probable, since that star did not "rise out of Jacob;" nor does St. Matthew, who carefully collects the Messianic fulfilments in his gospel, apply

And a sceptre shall spring up from Israel,  
 And shall strike the chiefs of Moab,  
 And shall waste all the children <sup>5</sup> of Seth.  
 And he shall possess <sup>6</sup> Idumea,  
 The inheritance of Seir shall come to their enemies,  
 But Israel shall do manfully.

the prophecy to that event. 2. The star is the figure of a mighty king. Reasons: *a.* The star has served among all nations as the symbol of regal power and dignity (Virg., *Eclog.* ix. 47; Horat., *Od.* I. xii. 47; Justin, *Histor.* xxxvii. 2; Curtius, IX. vi. 8; Sueton. lxxxviii.; Æschyl., *Agam.* 6; Is. xiv. 12; Dan. viii. 10; Apoc. i. 16, 20; ii. 1; ix. 1). *b.* The idea was current among the Jews, since the false Messiah appearing after Jesus was called Bar-cochab, i.e., son of a star.

<sup>5</sup> **Children of Seth.** Explanations: 1. Seth is a proper name (Vulg., LXX., and ancient versions generally). *a.* It refers to Seth, the son of Adam, so that children of Seth is equivalent to "all mankind." The passage thus understood is often explained: "he shall rule all mankind" (Onkelos, Rashi, etc.). But "all mankind" is never called "the children of Seth," though it may be called "the children of Adam or the children of Noe." Again, the king foretold will not destroy mankind, but save it; or if the other explanation of ruling be preferred, it must be kept in mind that the verb does not bear the sense "to rule." The passage in Jer. xlviii. 45 too demands another explanation, since that prophet evidently borrows from the present passage. *b.* Seth is the proper name of a Moabite prince (Winzer). This explanation is more satisfactory, but is based on a mere conjecture. *c.* Seth is connected with the Hebrew word "shaon" used in Jer. xlviii. 45, so that the children of "Seth" signifies "the children of noise," or "tumultuous ones" (Gesen., Keil, Fürst, Maurer, Reinke, etc.). The term "tumultuous ones" is rightly considered to designate the Moabites (cf. Ex. xv. 15; Is. xv. 4; xvi. 6). 3. The word Seth is connected with the Hebrew "shathah," so that the children of Seth are the children of the drunkard (Hiller, Hofmann, Kurtz). The drunkard to whom allusion is made is by these authors identified with Lot (Gen. xix. 32), the progenitor of the Moabites. 4. The word Seth is connected with the Hebrew "sheeth," elevation, pride, so that we must translate "the children of boasting" (Zunz). The reference of Jeremias (xlviii. 45) to this passage seems to render the second opinion most probable, though Zunz too identifies the Moabites with the "sons of boasting." Another explanation will be mentioned later on.

<sup>6</sup> **Idumea.** Idumea is the country of Edom, or Esau; the Edomites had refused free passage through their territory to the Israelites when the latter asked them for it through messengers sent from Cades. It is therefore just that Edom and Moab should incur the same punishment, as they had contracted the same guilt. Seir was the older name of the mountain land south of Moab and east of the Arabah, which the Edomites inhabited (Gen. xxxvi. 8; Deut. ii. 1, etc.).

Out of Jacob shall he come that <sup>7</sup> shall rule,  
And shall destroy the <sup>8</sup> remains of the city.

<sup>7</sup> **He that shall rule.** This is the parallel term to the "sceptre" and the "star" which are foretold to spring forth from Jacob. By destroying the remains of the city, or him that remaineth of the city, the conqueror is described as hunting out the fugitives till he has cut off all of every place, after defeating his enemies in battle.

<sup>8</sup> **Remains of the city.** Prof. A. H. Sayce (Hebraica, Oct., 1887, pp. 3 ff.) is of opinion that the passage from "I shall see him" to "shall do manfully," etc., is an old Amorrite song of triumph adapted by Balaam to the successes of Israel. According to this theory, the same poem occurs at least four times in Scripture in slightly varied form. Its oldest form is preserved in Num. xxi. 28, while Jer. xlviii. 45, 46 and Am. ii. 2 follow Balaam's adaptation more closely. For the right understanding of the latter, a comparison with the oldest form is of the greatest importance. It reads: "A fire is gone out of Hesebon, a flame from the city of Schon, and hath consumed Ar of the Moabites, and the inhabitants of the high places of the Arnon." From this we see that Balaam has substituted Jacob and Israel for Hesebon and the city of Schon; star and sceptre for fire and flame. The verb which Balaam uses after these lines, "strike," fits in with the sceptre only, not with the star, if it be taken literally. Hence we must interpret the star symbolically, as king or prince. The Hebrew word rendered "chiefs" is translated "temples" by Ewald and Sayce. The latter scholar suggests the reading qadqad instead of qarqar, so that we must translate "it has shattered the temples of Moab."

This emendation suggests then another meaning for "the children of Seth;" for this expression is now parallel to "the temples of Moab," as it replaces the original "inhabitants of the high places of the Arnon." Now the latter are the Moabites who worship in the high places of the Arnon; the children of Seth must then be the same Moabite worshippers. From the analogy of Ben-Ammi or Ammonite in Gen. xix. 38 we infer then that Seth was a god as Ammon was, and this inference is verified by archaeological evidence. *a.* At the foot of the south-eastern angle of the Haram at Jerusalem, Sir C. Warren found, among other fragments of early pottery, two handles ornamented with a representation of the winged solar disk and inscriptions in Phœnician letters of the pre-exilic period. One of these reads: "belonging to Melech-Tsiph," the other, "belonging to Melech-Sheth." The latter name means "Moloch is Sheth" according to the analogy of Malchiel, Malchiyah, Melchizedek. Hence Seth was not only a deity, but his worshippers have left their remains in the valley of the sons of Hinnom. *b.* Dr. Neubauer has pointed out that this well agrees with the fact that the antediluvian patriarch Seth was the father of Enosh, or man, as well as with the proper names Mephi-bosheth and Ish-bosheth (II. Kings ii 8; I. Par. viii. 33), in which Bosheth is a contraction for Ben-Sheth, as Bedad has been formed out of Bendad. *c.* The same inference is confirmed by the meaning of Bosheth, "shame;" from II. Kings x. 4 and Is. xx. 4 it would seem that "Sheth" means "the phallus," a meaning con-



## COROLLARY.

We may point out the following Messianic notes and characteristics contained in Balaam's prophecy: *a.* The predicted ruler will belong to the family of Jacob. *b.* He will be powerful enough to destroy all Israel's enemies, present and future. *c.* As the protevangelium describes a conqueror of the serpent, who himself will have to suffer in the struggle, as the second prediction given to Sem points out that man's salvation will be brought about by God's mysterious dwelling in the tents of Sem, and as, finally, the series of the patriarchal blessings implies the priestly office of the future Saviour of mankind, so does the present prophecy show forth the Redeemer's regal and princely character. *d.* It is also worthy of note that Balaam is the first prophet who touches the time of the future Redeemer. Its indication, however, is couched in the negative terms, "not now," "not near."

firmed by the Assyrian *sinatu*, "urine." The phallus-worship among the ancients is too well known to need further description. As to the Moabites in particular, their Beelphegor-worship is told in Num. xxv. 1-3. *d.* Sayce finds another confirmation for his rendering of the passage in Gen. iv. 7: "If thou doest well, it is Sheth; but if ill, Chatath lieth at the door." The latter he identifies with the Assyrian plague-god Nerra, of whom the inscriptions say: "Nerra lieth at the gate." Sheth, therefore, must mean the god of generation, so that the passage means: "If thou do well, thy offspring will be abundant; but if ill, the angel of pestilence will afflict thee." It should, however, be kept in mind that this interpretation as well as that given of Num. xxiv. 17-19 is new and is not found in Christian tradition. For though we do not deny that new light may be thrown on Scripture by new investigations, these results must be well weighed before they can be accepted.

## CHAPTER VI.

## THE MESSIAS IS THE SON OF DAVID.

## Section I. The Son of David Shall Rule Forever.

II. Kings vii. 1-16 ; I. Par. xvii. 1-17.

## INTRODUCTION.

**1. HISTORY OF THE PROPHECY.**—The second Book of Samuel, or of Kings, as it is named in our editions, opens with the lament of David over Saul and Jonathan. David is then made king at Hebron over Juda, and subsequently, after the murder of Ishboeth, over all Israel (c. ii.—v. 3). Joab next captures the stronghold of Jebus, which David henceforth makes his residence (v. 4-16); then follow successful wars against the Philistines (v. 17-25), and the ark is removed from the house of Obededom to the city of David (vi.). Now David formed the purpose of building the Lord a temple in accordance with Deut. xii. 10 ff., but Nathan the prophet reveals to him that the Lord reserves this work for his son.

**2. AUTHORSHIP OF THE PROPHECY.**—According to Driver (Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, New York, 1892), Anna's song and the prophecy of Nathan are among the parts which in their present form have some affinities in thought and expression with Deuteronomy, though decidedly less marked than those observable in the Redaction of Kings, so that they can hardly be later than c. 400 B.C.

The contents of the Books of Samuel are so various and abundant that they can hardly be the work of any single

man, and the descriptions are so minute and accurate that we cannot suppose oral tradition to be the only source of the books. On the other hand, the books cannot be considered a mere compilation of pre-existing documents, since they constitute one continuous whole. The repetitions which are said to occur are either the mere history of a repeated fact—thus David fled twice to the Philistines, and twice he proved his marvellous generosity towards Saul—or they are narrating the same fact from different points of view and in different connections, as may be seen in the history of the Ammonite-Syrian war, which is mentioned in II. Kings viii. 12, and again in x. 1 ff., in order to connect this event with David's sin.

The author of the books is not named in Sacred Scripture, and Samuel, who is called their author in the Babylonian Gemara, can hardly have written them, since they contain numerous events that happened after Samuel's death. The opinions that Gad, or Nathan, or Isaias, or Jeremias, or Ezechias, or Esdras, has written the books are without solid foundation. We believe that Samuel and Gad and Nathan are the joint authors of Kings I., II. (I. Par. xxix. 29; xxvii. 24; ancient tradition).

The time of composition may be inferred from the following facts: 1. Mention is made of a distinction between Juda and Israel, a distinction that was introduced in David's time (I. Kings xi. 8; xvii. 52; xviii. 16; II. Kings ii. 9-10; v. 1-5; xix. 41; xx. 2; II. Kings iii. 10; xxiv. 1). 2. On the other hand, the author does not tell us of Solomon's reign, though he supposes David's death (II. Kings v. 4), and asserts that Siceleg belongs to the kings of Juda (I. Kings xxvii. 6): the last of these facts seems to show that the division into the two kingdoms had already taken place at the time of the writer. 3. In the Septuagint version of II. Kings viii. 7 and xiv. 27 there is mention of Roboam; if then the authenticity of these passages were beyond dispute, it would be certain that the books have been written during the reign of Roboam. The facts con-

tained in I. Kings viii. 8; xii. 2; xxix. 3, 6, 8; II. Kings vii. 6, which are sometimes alleged as indicative of the author's time, do not shed any real light on the subject. The books must have been completed towards the end of Solomon's reign, or under his son Roboam.

**3. MESSIANIC CHARACTER OF THE PROPHECY.**—1. Nathan's prediction is regarded as a prediction after the event by those authors whose views have been stated above in Driver's synopsis. Here belong De Wette, Movers, Ewald, Baur, Diestel (cf. Meignan, "*Prophéties Messianiques*," Paris, 1878, pp. 120 ff.). According to these writers the words of Nathan, which were very few and most obscure, have after the event been amplified into the present prophecy. This view has been sufficiently refuted where the age of the Books of Kings was determined.

2. The Messianic reference of Nathan's prophecy is clear from Christian tradition. *a.* Not to speak of the epistle to the Hebrews (i. 5) in which the Apostle understands the passage of Christ's natural divine sonship, *b.* we may point to the testimony of Tert. (M. 2, 350), Lact. (6, 486), Just. (6, 750), Euseb. (22, 430), Cyr. Alex. (76, 114), Basil (32, 882), Theodoret, Procop., Walaf., St. Augustine (Civ. Dei, xvii. 8), of St. Chrysostom (Hom. 23 in Act. Apost.), and of St. Ambrose (Apol. David altera; cf. St. Aug., de præsent. Dei, 35; in Ps. cxxvi.). *c.* Besides, it must be observed that in point of fact, the whole prediction perfectly agrees with Jesus Christ: he is the son of David, he has built a house unto God by instituting the Church, his royal throne will last for ever, he is the Son of God, he has been chastised by God for our sins; still the mercy of God has not departed from him, but has raised him from the dead and given him all power in heaven and on earth.

3. The question may be raised whether Nathan's prediction applies to Christ in its literal or in a typical sense. There are certain reasons which would seem to show that all applies to Christ, and to Christ alone, in its literal meaning. *a.* Jesus alone reigns for ever, and *b.* according

to St. Paul God has said of him alone: "I will be to him a father" (cf. Heb. i. 5). But, on the other hand, there are certain reasons that prevent us from applying the prediction to Jesus Christ alone. *a.* According to verse 13, the material temple seems to be had in view; *b.* the comparison with Saul which is found in the passage does not well suit Jesus; *c.* in Ps. lxxxviii. (lxxxix.) 31 it is clearly stated that verse 14 refers to the personal sins of David's descendants; *d.* the eternity of the predicted reign does not exclude the other descendants of David, though it necessarily includes also the Messiah.

4. These reasons for and against the literal application of the passage to the Messiah have occasioned a difference of opinion concerning the real import of the prophecy. There are some authors who understand verses 12 and 13 and the second part of verse 14 literally of Solomon, while the other parts are applied to the Messiah in their literal meaning. It is true that *a.* no fact of history contradicts this exposition, and *b.* that Heb. i. 5 is thus applied to Christ alone, as it must be; but, on the other hand, *a.* no reader finds such a mingling of the literal sense of Scripture natural or plausible, and *b.* I. Par. xxii. 10 demands that the first part of verse 14, quoted in Heb. i. 5, be applied to Solomon in its literal sense.

5. On account of these reasons, other authors have thought fit to apply the whole passage in its literal sense to Solomon and his offspring, including the Messiah, because all these will exercise the royal power in their own time and order. Some of these will be bad men, and therefore the Lord will correct them by means of punishments, without on that account withdrawing his favor from the race as such. And if it be said that St. Paul in the repeatedly quoted passage of the epistle to the Hebrews applies this prophecy to Christ's natural sonship of God, which cannot be applied to the other descendants of David, it must be kept in mind that the apostle argues from the typical meaning of the passage, which applies to Jesus Christ alone

as the antitype. Again, it may be said that the whole prophecy applies to the whole series of David's offspring, but is not equally fulfilled in the single members. This explanation is given by Reinke, Hengstenberg; Corluy and Cardinal Patrizi give a similar explanation.

6. According to Cardinal Patrizi *we are bound* to apply the words, "I will be to him a father, and he shall be to me a son," in their typical sense to the Messiah on account of St. Paul's argument in the epistle to the Hebrews. For the apostle uses the words about Christ's natural sonship of God, and since they do not signify this in their literal sense, they must have this meaning in their typical sense. As to the rest of Nathan's prediction, we *may* apply it typically to the Messiah, but are not bound to do so. For it is well understood that David and Solomon are types of the Messiah: *a.* Ps. lxxi. (lxxii.) mingles the praise of Solomon with that of the Messiah, or rather it describes the Messiah in such a manner that the description applies also to Solomon. *b.* Jer. xxx. 9 calls the Messiah king David. *c.* In Ps. xv. (xvi.) 10, 11; xxi. (xxii.) 17-19 David impersonates the Messiah. *d.* The Messianic types of David and Solomon appear also in Ezech. xxxiv. 23, 24; Os. iii. 5; Amos ix. 11. *e.* Solomon, the favorite son of David, is rightly looked upon as a type of the true son of David (Is. xi. 1; Jer. xxii. 30; Matt. i. 1; Luke i. 32; Apoc. xxii. 16; v. 5; Matt. xii. 23; xv. 22; xxi. 9; Mark xii. 35-37; Jo. vii. 42; Rom. i. 3; II. Tim. ii. 8). *f.* The very name of Solomon, or "Peaceful," prefigures the peace of the Messianic reign (cf. Mich. v. 5; Is. ix. 6, 7; Luke i. 79; ii. 14; Is. liii. 5; Jo. xiv. 27; Acts x. 36; Eph. ii. 14, 17; Col. i. 20, etc.). *g.* The extraordinary wisdom possessed by Solomon is rightly regarded as a type of the eternal Wisdom, or the Word Incarnate (cf. Col. ii. 3).

## II. KINGS VII. 1-16.

And it came to pass, when the king sat in his house, and the Lord had given him rest on every side from all his enemies, he



said to Nathan the prophet : "Dost thou see that I dwell in a house of cedar, and the ark of God is lodged within skins?" And Nathan said to the king : "Go do all that is in thy heart, because the Lord is with thee." But it came to pass that night that the word of the Lord came to Nathan, saying : "Go and say to thy servant David :

"Thus saith the Lord : Shalt thou build me a house to dwell in, whereas I have not dwelt in a house from the day that I brought the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt even to this day, but have walked in a tabernacle, and in a tent, in all the places that I have gone through with all the children of Israel? Did I ever speak a word to any one of the tribes of Israel, whom I commanded to feed my people Israel, saying : Why have you not built me a house of cedar? And now thus shalt thou speak to my servant David : Thus saith the Lord of hosts : I took thee out of the pastures from following the sheep to be ruler over my people Israel, and I have been with thee wheresoever thou hast walked, and have slain all thy enemies from before thy face, and I have made thee a great name, like unto the name of the great ones that are on the earth. And I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and I will plant them, and they shall dwell therein, and shall be disturbed no more, neither shall the children of iniquity afflict them any more as they did before, from the day that I appointed judges over my people Israel, and I will give thee rest from all thy enemies.

"And <sup>1</sup> the Lord foretelleth <sup>2</sup> to thee

<sup>1</sup> **The Lord foretelleth to thee.** The following is an outline of God's special dispensation as it is manifested in the present passage; God's manner of dwelling among the people corresponds to the nation's political condition. While the people journeyed in the desert, or were harassed by their enemies, God dwelt among them in a tent. The temple will be the sign of the nation's final establishment in its theocratic constitution. At the time when David intended to build the temple, the theocratic kingdom was not yet firmly established. For the house of David was to be its stay and foundation, and the house of David had not yet conquered all its enemies; David was a warrior, while the temple must be built to serve as the sign and the seal, as it were, of David's everlasting kingship. Consequently, the Lord must first build David's house, before David's house can build the temple (cf. Clair, in II. Kings vii. 11).

<sup>2</sup> **The Lord foretelleth to thee.** The divine promises may be reduced to three: *a.* the everlasting reign of David's family; *b.* the erection of the temple by the seed of David; *c.* the exaltation of David's seed to the divine sonship.

That the Lord will make thee a house<sup>3</sup> ;  
 And when thy days shall be fulfilled,  
 And thou shalt sleep with thy fathers,  
 I will raise up thy seed after thee  
 Which shall proceed out of thy womb,  
 I will establish his kingdom ;  
 He shall build a house to my name,  
 And I will establish the throne of his kingdom for<sup>4</sup> ever ;  
 I will be to him a father,  
 And he shall be to me a son ;  
 And if he commit any iniquity,

*a.* Balaam had foretold that a ruler should spring from the family of Jacob ; the dying Jacob had pointed out that the ruler would rise in the lion of Juda ; Nathan's prediction enlarges the idea of the coming ruler, while it limits his origin to the family of David. The seed of the woman, the seed of the patriarchs, is now identified with the seed of David.

*b.* Noe had predicted that the Lord would be the God of Sem, would dwell in a special manner in the tents of Sem ; Nathan's prophecy points out that the Lord will dwell in the city of Jerusalem, in the temple ; but the temple itself is only a historical fact which points in its significance to the future. While it symbolizes the full establishment of the theocratic kingdom, it typifies also that which is symbolized by the theocracy—the Messianic times, when God will dwell in a new manner among men through the instrumentality of David's royal seed.

*c.* At the Exodus, Israel had been taken up into the divine sonship (Ex. iv. 22) ; David's seed will enjoy this sonship in a far higher sense. But there are two sides which will characterize this sonship: mercy and chastisement. The latter is described as inflicted in order to remove sin ; it is therefore a chastisement of redemption, a type of the Redeemer's suffering in order to free us from our sins. Here it must be noted again that Nathan's prophecy carries the Messianic idea further than it had been made known before that time. It had indeed been foretold that the serpent would lie in wait for the woman's seed, but now the suffering is no more to come from the serpent or the serpent's seed, but from God himself with a view to future correction (cf. Briggs, "Messianic Prophecy," p. 128).

<sup>3</sup> **House.** This word has either its proper (I. Par. xvii. 4) or a metaphorical meaning (Ex. i. 21 ; Deut. xxv. 9 ; Ruth iv. 11 ; 1 Kings ii. 35), as its context requires. In the present prophecy it occurs in both meanings, as the text shows.

<sup>4</sup> **For ever.** This clause denotes sometimes a very long time, sometimes an eternal duration in the strict sense of the word. Its emphasis in the present prophecy, its absolute form, its parallel passages (Ps. lxxxviii. 30, 38 ; lxxi. 5, 7, 17), its Messianic reference (Luke i. 32, 33), are so many indications that eternity in the strict sense of the word is here spoken of.

I will correct him with the rod of men,  
And with the stripes of the children of men.  
But my mercy I will not take away from him,  
As I took it from Saul,  
Whom I removed from before my face.  
And thy house shall be faithful,  
And thy kingdom for ever before thy face,  
And thy throne shall be firm for ever."

According to all these words, and according to all this vision, so did Nathan speak to David.

#### COROLLARY.

1. The following are, therefore, the Messianic characteristics predicted in Nathan's prophecy: *a.* The Messiah will be of David's flesh and seed. *b.* He will be David's heir. *c.* His reign will last for ever. *d.* He will surely come, however unfaithful the house of David may prove to be. *e.* He will be the natural son of God.

2. But it follows from the preceding paragraphs that not all these particulars could be understood from the prophecy unless God specially enlightened the mind of the reader or hearer. What David could naturally infer from Nathan's words was that some kind of royal power would remain in his family for ever, or at least for a long space of time. In point of fact, however, the Holy Ghost seems to have enlightened David's mind so that he understood also the Messianic reference clearly. This we conclude from Acts ii. 30, 31; Ps. xv. (xvi.) 10; lxxi. (lxxii.); xlv. (xlv.) 7.

#### Section II. The Son of David is the Prince of Pastors.

Jer. xxiii. 1-8.; cf. Jer. xxxiii. 14-26.

#### INTRODUCTION.

1. CONNECTION OF THE PROPHECY WITH ITS CONTEXT.—Jer. xxi. 11-xxiii. 8 forms an important group of prophecies. The divine judgments on the successive rulers who occupied in Jeremiah's day the throne of David are vividly

described. An introductory statement is found in xxi. 11-14; then follows an admonition impressing upon the king the paramount importance of justice, xxii. 1-9; this part may be regarded as the fulfilment of Deut. xxix. 23 f.; next follow the special judgments on the individual kings. First Sellum (Shallum, the recompensed, who must be identified with Joachaz) will suffer perpetual banishment in Egypt, vv. 10-12; Joakim (Jehoiakim) will have an ignominious end, since his exactions strangely contrast with the just dealings of his father Josias, vv. 13-19; in the third place, Jechonias (Jehoiachin) will be banished to a foreign land, vv. 20-30.

After this follows the climax of the entire prophecy in xxiii. 1-8: vv. 1-2 contain a denunciation of the faithless shepherds who have neglected and ruined their charge; but if thus the one part of II. Kings vii. 14 finds its fulfilment, God does not forget the favorable promise made to the house of David. Consequently, Jeremiah closes with a promise of ultimate restoration, and a picture of the rule of the ideal king springing from Jesse's seed, contrasting this rule point by point with the defects of his own contemporary kings, vv. 3-8. Such contrasts are noticeable between xxii. 13, 17 and xxiii. 5*b*; xxiii. 1-2 and xxiii. 6*a*; iii. 15 and xxiii. 4. About the special meaning of the royal names in these prophecies commentators are not yet agreed; some of the more plausible explanations may be seen in Knabenbauer (*In Jer.*, p. 283) and in Hengstenberg (*Christology*, Washington, 1839, iii. pp. 398 f.).

2. **JER. XXXIII. 14-26** is parallel to Jer. xxiii. 1-8; in fact, Driver calls it a mere repetition in a slightly varied form; Briggs (*Messianic Prophecy*, p. 244) says: "These [prophecies] are essentially the same, and yet they differ in certain important particulars, showing that the second passage is an enlargement and an improvement upon the first." The principal difficulty arising in connection with the second passage is the doubt concerning its authenticity. The doubt has its foundation in the fact that *a.* the second

passage is wanting in the LXX., and *b.* that parts of the passage are a mere repetition of previous prophecies; thus vv. 14, 15, 16 are nearly the same as Jer. xxiii. 5, 6; vv. 20-22 are almost identical with xxxi. 35-37; vv. 25, 26 are apparently taken from the same place.

It is on this account that J. D. Michaelis, Jahn, Hitzig, Movers, and Scholz reject the authenticity of Jer. xxxiii. 14-26. Catholic authors generally, and among non-Catholics, Küper, Hengstenberg, Ewald, Graf, Keil, and Smith defend the authenticity of our passage. As to its absence from the LXX. version, *a.* it may be owing to an accident, or *b.* the Hebrew copy from which the version was made may have accidentally lacked the passage. *c.* Hengstenberg is of opinion that its absence from the LXX. proves only that even at such an early date there were scholars who had as little critical judgment as those learned men of our day manifest who reject the passage as unauthentic (cf. Knabenbauer, in Jer., p. 421; Hengstenberg, "Christology," Washington, 1839, iii. p. 445; Briggs, "Messianic Prophecy," p. 244, etc.).

**3. SUBJECT OF THE PROPHECY.**—The principal subject of the prophecy is determined by the meaning of the "pastors" in v. 4, of the "just branch" in v. 5, and of the "Lord our just one" in v. 6. *a.* Venema agrees with several scholars preceding him in explaining v. 4 as referring to the time of the Machabees. But it must be granted that according to the context the "pastors" will be connected with "the just branch" of David; now the Machabees did not belong to David's royal family. *b.* The same reasoning holds with regard to Grotius' opinion according to which the "pastors" refer to Esdras and Nehemias. *c.* The explanation according to which Zorobabel is spoken of in the fourth verse is, at least, incomplete; it is, however, defended by St. Ephrem, Theodor., Calmet, Reinke, Sanct., etc. Hengstenberg endeavors to exclude this interpretation for two reasons: First, the subject spoken of in verse 4 must be identified with the "just branch" men-

tioned in the fifth verse; now the latter can hardly be identified with Zorobabel. Secondly, if Zorobabel were spoken of in the fourth verse, Jeremias would describe the Israelite salvation by degrees; but such a gradual development of salvation is unknown in the prophet Jeremias (cf. Hengst., iii. p. 406). The fourth verse speaks about "pastors" in the plural, because the evil to which this particular good is opposed consisted of a series of individuals, or else because the opposing good is considered as a generic idea. *d.* The majority of Christian interpreters explain v. 4 as referring to the Messiah (Mald., Mar., Lap., Men., Tir., Bade, Scholz, Schn., Hengst., etc.). *α.* The connection of the verse with the following, *β.* the extent of the promises connected with the shepherds, *γ.* the New Testament passages representing the Messiah as the good shepherd, and *δ.* the usual way in which Jeremias describes the Messianic salvation are so many proofs that the Messiah is spoken of in the fourth verse. *e.* Still all this may be granted, and nevertheless the above-mentioned reference of the passage maintained, in so far as Zorobabel is truly a type of the future Messiah. Such a view would remove most of the difficulties above stated, and would satisfy all exigencies of text and context.

Thus far we have supposed that the context of verse 4 refers to the Messiah; this supposition must now be based on a solid foundation. Verse 5 supplies us several proofs for our position. *a.* The "branch" is a peculiarly Messianic title, as may be inferred from the dying words of David (II. Kings xxiii. 3-5 Heb.), from Is. iv. 2; Zach. iii. 8; vi. 12. Then, he who is here called "the branch" is named "David," Jer. xxx. 9; "pastor," Ezech. xxxiv. 23; "my servant David," Ezech. xxxvii. 24 (cf. Os. iii. 5; Mich. v. 1; Is. xi. 1; Am. ix. 12). *b.* The words "a king shall reign" bear a peculiarly Messianic reference. The restoration of the theocracy had been repeatedly promised, and the Davidic king was foretold in II. Kings vii. 14 and II. Kings xxiii. 3-5 (Heb.). *c.* The words "shall be wise"



have also a Messianic bearing, as may be seen from Is. xi. 2; xlii. 1; lii. 13 (Heb.). *d.* Finally, the clause "and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth" well agrees with the Messianic explanation of the whole passage. For similar attributes are predicated of the Messiah in Is. ix. 6, 7; xi. 3 f.; xlii. 6; xlix. 6, 7 f. . . . David is therefore rightly considered as the type and the model of the Messiah (II. Kings viii. 15).

The Messianic reference of the whole passage is also confirmed by the sixth verse, where the name of the coming Saviour is given as "the Lord our just one," or, as the Hebrew text reads, "the Lord our justice." For though Scholz, Ewald, Graf, Naeg., Cheyne refer this name to Israel, their reason for doing so is by no means proof against all exceptions. It is true that in xxxiii. 16 Jeremias applies this name to Jerusalem, but this fact does not show that the prophet applies the name to Jerusalem where-soever he uses it. *a.* As the context in which Jeremias employs this name differs in different passages, so may its application vary in various contexts. It is not at all improper that Jerusalem should be named "the Lord our justice," since Jerusalem as the type of the Church represents the Messiah's mystical body. *b.* But in the present context, the opening clause shows unmistakably that the Messiah himself is denoted by the name. For in the Hebrew text we read "in his days," and not "in those days." The pronoun "his" refers back, therefore, to the "branch" of the preceding verse. *c.* At the same time it is connected with the "him" of the sixth verse. Hence the "him" of verse 6 is identical with the "branch," which we have shown to be a name of the Messiah. And consequently, "the Lord our justice" is the name by which they shall call the Messiah.

Finally, we must add a few Rabbinic testimonies to show that our interpretation of Jeremias' prophecy agrees with that of the Synagogue. The Targum translates the clause of verse 5, "I will raise up to David a just branch," by the

words: "I will raise unto David the Messiah the just." The Talmud (*Baba Bathra*, 75*b*; *Yalkut in loco*) has the following comment on the sixth verse: "Rabbi Samuel, the son of Nachman, said in the name of Rabbi Jonathan: 'Three are called by the name of the Holy One, blessed be he! viz.: the just, the Messiah, and Jerusalem. Of the just it is said: Every one that is called by my name (*Is. xliii. 7*). Of the Messiah it is said: This is his name. . . And of Jerusalem it is written: And the name of the city from that day shall be, 'The Lord is there' (*Ezech. xlviii. 35*)."

The Midrash on Lamentations i. 16 bears clear testimony for the Messianic character of our passage: "What is the name of the king Messiah? Rabbi Abba, son of Kahana, said: Jehovah, for it is written: This is his name whereby he shall be called, the Lord our Righteousness. Rabbi Levi said: Blessed is the city whose name is like the name of its king, and the name of its king like the name of his God. Blessed is the city whose name is like the name of its king; because it is written: And the name of the city from that day shall be 'Jehovah is there' (*Ezech. xlviii. 35*); and the name of its king like the name of its God; for it is written: And this is his name whereby. . . Rabbi Joshna, son of Levi, said: Branch is the name of the Messiah, for it is written: Behold the man whose name is Branch, and he shall grow out of his place. Rabbi Judan said, in the name of Rabbi Ibo: Comforter (*Menachem*) is his name; for it is written: The comforter is far from me (*Iam. i. 16*). Rabbi Hanina replied: There is no contradiction in the assertions of both; for *Zemach* and *Menachem* are equal in number" (cf. Midrash on *Ps. xxi. 1*; *Prov. xix. 21*; *Mechilta on Jer. xvi. 14*).

The Talmud (*Berachoth*, fol. xii. col. ii.) has a similar testimony on *Jer. xxiii. 7, 8*: "Ben-Zoma asked the wise men: Will mention be made of the Egyptian Exodus in the days of the Messiah? Is it not said: The days come, saith the Lord. . . ? They replied: The Egyptian Exodus

will not lose its place altogether, but will only become secondary, in view of the liberation from the subjection to the other Gentile kingdoms."

The Targum translates Jer. xxxiii. 15: "I will raise up unto David the Messiah of justice," instead of the common version: "I will make the bud of justice to spring forth unto David." Hence the Messianic interpretation given by the Synagogue of the latter passage is beyond dispute.

#### JER. XXIII. 1-8.

"Woe to the pastors<sup>1</sup> that destroy and tear the sheep of my pasture," saith the Lord. Therefore thus saith the Lord the God of Israel to the pastors that feed my people: "You have scattered my flock, and driven them away, and have not visited them; behold I will visit upon you for the evil of your doings," saith the Lord.

"And I will<sup>2</sup> gather together the remnant of my flock, out of all the lands into which I have east them out, and I will make them return to their own fields, and they shall increase and be multiplied."

"And I will set up pastors over them, and they shall feed them; they shall fear no more, and they shall not be dismayed, and none shall be wanting of their number," saith the Lord.

<sup>1</sup> **Pastors.** The pastors are the kings of the people (cf. Jer. xxii. 22; II. Kings v. 2; vii. 7). Their crime is twofold: they have corrupted the people of God morally, and have ruined them socially; for in the theocratic state moral and social welfare are connected. This general threat of the Lord against the unfaithful shepherds is then specially applied to the unfaithful pastors of Israel. Their sins are summarized in the clause: "you have not visited them." God, therefore, summarizes their punishment too in the words: "I will visit upon you for the evil of your doings."

<sup>2</sup> **I will gather together.** After announcing the punishment of the pastors the prophet proceeds to predict the mercies of God towards his people. They are reduced to three heads: 1. God will gather the remnant of his flock which the unfaithful pastors had scattered into all lands, and will restore it to the land of promise, where it will prosper and multiply. 2. Instead of the faithless pastors God will set up faithful shepherds, who will provide the proper nourishment, will ward off all danger, and will not lose any under their charge. 3. Finally, God will raise up the "just branch" of David's line, who will rule with wisdom and justice all the world over. This will give rise to his name "the Lord our just one."

“Behold the days come,” saith the Lord, “and I will raise up to David a just branch; and a king shall reign, and shall be wise; and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In those days shall Juda be saved, and Israel shall dwell confidently; and this is the name that they shall call him: The Lord our just one.”

“Therefore,<sup>3</sup> behold the days come,” saith the Lord, “and they shall say no more: The Lord liveth who brought up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt; but: The Lord liveth who hath brought out and hath brought hither the seed of the house of Israel from the north country, and out of all the lands, to which I had cast them forth; and they shall dwell in their own land.”

#### JER. XXXIII. 14-26.

“Behold,<sup>4</sup> the days come,” saith the Lord, “that I will perform the good word that I have spoken to the house of Israel,

<sup>3</sup> **Therefore, behold the days come.** In the third place the prophet describes the sentiments of the gathered flock after its restoration. Even as Israel testified the greatest gratitude to God for its delivery from Egypt, so will the restored children of Israel praise God for bringing them from the north country and out of all the lands into which they had been driven through the carelessness of their pastors.

<sup>4</sup> **Behold the days come.** The whole prophetic passage (Jer. xxxiii. 14-26) may be divided into three parts: 1. God promises in general his Messianic blessings, including a continuation of David's royal house in the bud of justice, and of the sacrifice by the hands of the priests and Levites. The city itself will thus according to the Hebrew text be named “the Lord our just one,” taking its name from the name of its king and master (vv. 14-18). 2. The restoration of David's kingdom and of the priests and Levites as well as the multiplication of David's and the Levites' seed is as sure as the regular interchange of day and night; since then with these two institutions the theocracy stands and falls, the future restoration of the theocracy is infallibly to come (vv. 19-22). 3. Finally, the prophet answers the doubts (vv. 23-26) of certain Chaldee or Egyptian or Samaritan tribes (Rhaban., St. Thom., Mar., Movers, Jahn, Trochon, Hitzig), or better of certain dissident members of the Jewish kingdom (Theod., Vat., Sanct., Lap., Calmet, Loch, Scholz, Schn., Nag., Keil, Or., etc.), who believe that the Lord has cast off his two chosen families, i.e., the kingdoms of Israel and Juda (Sanct., Gord., Scholz, Schn., Trochon), or the tribes of Juda and Benjamin (Malv.), or the families of David and Aaron (Theod., Mald., Mar., Reinke, Loch), or both the tribes of Juda and Benjamin and the families of David and Aaron (Lap., Tir.), or finally either the former or the latter pair (Rhaban., St. Thom., Calmet). The Lord consoles the dissident Israelites and confounds their boastful enemies by repeating the assurance of his love for the chosen people on account of its glorious ancestors (cf. Knabenb., in h. l.).

and to the house of Juda. In those days and at that time, I will make the bud of justice to spring forth unto David, and he shall do judgment and justice in the earth. In those days shall Juda be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell securely, and this is the name that they shall call him : The Lord our just one."

For thus saith the Lord: "There shall not be cut off from David a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel. Neither shall there be cut off from the priests and Levites a man before my face, to offer holocausts, and to burn sacrifice, and to kill victims continually."

And the word of the Lord came to Jeremias, saying: "Thus saith the Lord: if my covenant with the day can be made void, and my covenant with the night, that there should not be day and night in their season: then may also my covenant with David my servant be made void, that he should not have a son to reign upon his throne, and with the Levites and priests my ministers. As the stars of heaven cannot be numbered, nor the sand of the sea be measured: so will I multiply the seed of David my servant, and the Levites my ministers."

And the word of the Lord came to Jeremias, saying: "Hast thou not seen that this people hath spoken, saying: 'The two families which the Lord had chosen are cast off,' and they have despised my people, so that it is no more a nation before them?" Thus saith the Lord: "If I have not set my covenant between day and night, and laws to heaven and earth: then indeed I will also cast off the seed of Jacob, and of David my servant, so as not to take any of his seed to be rulers of the seed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. For I will bring back their captivity and will have mercy on them."

#### COROLLARIES.

1. The people of Israel is assured that whatever moral and political evils have befallen the theocracy on account of its faithless pastors the Lord himself will repair by means of faithful pastors and of the just and wise rule brought in by David's branch. And since the latter was commonly identified with the Messias, it follows that Jeremias consoles the people with the Messianic hope, and thus strengthens it to bear patiently the evils of the coming exile.

2. Since David's branch will be called "Jahveh our just one" many interpreters have looked upon this name as indicating the divine nature of the Messiah. *a.* The question whether the subject of the clause "they shall call him" is indefinite (Jerome and the majority of commentators) or whether "the Lord" must be supplied (LXX.), is of no special weight either for or against the foregoing opinion. *b.* The opinion is more solidly supported by the fact that the Messiah must be what he is named. But he is called "Jahveh our justice." Hence he is "Jahveh our justice." But the divine name Jahveh is incommunicable to creatures. Hence the Messiah is God. Still, this argument is considerably weakened by the consideration that Jerusalem bears the same name in Jer. xxxiii. 16 (Heb.), and that the altars erected by Moses and Jacob have a divine name (Ex. xvii. 15 (Heb.); Gen. xxxiii. 20 (Heb.)). *c.* Nor is the argument that the preceding reason is valid because it rests on the name of a person strong enough to render the opinion in defence of which it is urged scientifically probable. For there are many proper and personal names in Hebrew which are etymologically composed of El or Jahveh, like the name "Jahveh our justice," without on that account implying the divinity of the bearer. Joachaz, Joakim, Jechonias, Sedecias are only a few examples illustrating this fact. *d.* It is therefore safer to prove the divinity of the Messiah from other passages of the Old Testament. That done, one may return to the name "Jahveh our justice," and show that it contains a summary of the whole Messianic economy. It describes the Messiah, considered absolutely, as gifted with all the treasures of divinity; and, from a relative point of view, it represents him as the fountain of all supernatural grace, since he is our justice.

3. The priests of whom Jeremias here speaks are not the descendants of Aaron according to the flesh (cf. Jer. iii. 16; xxxi. 32). In the same manner the prophet must be understood to speak about the pastors and princes as the moral offspring of David. Ps. xlv. 8 supposes that the



Messias will have a number of companions in his work of redemption ; and since the Messias is called David, king, the prince of pastors (Ezech. xxxiv. 23; xxxvii. 22, 24, 25), his companions are rightly designated sons of David. The Hebrew word for "seed" bears such an interpretation, and the New Testament strictly agrees with it (Gal. iii. 20; I. Pet. ii. 5; Apoc. i. 6; v. 10).

**Section III. The Messias will spring from "the Marrow of the High Cedar."**

Ezech. xvii.

INTRODUCTION.

**1. TIME AND OCCASION OF THE PROPHECY.**—Nabuchodonosor, king of Babylon, had carried Jechonias (Joachin), the son of Joakim, to Babylon, after he had reigned only three months. Matthanias, Joachin's uncle and son of Josias, was made King of Juda in place of his nephew; his name was changed to "Sedecias" on the occasion of his swearing fidelity to the king of Babylon. All this occurred in the eighth year of Nabuchodonosor's reign. As early as the fourth year of Joakim's reign the prophet Jeremias had commanded all to subject themselves to Nabuchodonosor (Jer. xxv. 11), signifying that only on this condition Jerusalem would be saved from ruin (Jer. xxi. 8; xxxviii. 2, 17, 18). But Sedecias and his princes trusted in Egypt, expecting freedom from the Babylonian yoke through an Egyptian alliance. The oath of fidelity was broken, and open hostility against Babylon was begun. In this manner they revolted not only against Babylon, but also, and especially, against God, disobeying his commands and profaning his name. Ezechiel's prophecy is to be placed between the portion cc.viii.-xi., out of the sixth month of the sixth year, and c. xx., out of the fifth month of the seventh year, since the carrying away of Jechonias (599 B.C.). It was therefore spoken about five years before the destruction (c. 593 B.C.).

**2. DIVISION OF THE PROPHECY.**—The prophet describes in vv. 1–21 Sedecias' disloyalty to his Babylonian masters, and the consequences which will result from it; in vv. 22–24 he gives us a glance at brighter days to come, and the restoration of the Davidic kingdom in the future. The first part contains in vv. 3–10 an allegory, which is explained and applied to the circumstances in vv. 11–21.

**3. THE MESSIANIC CHARACTER OF THE PASSAGE** is proved in the Corollary.

#### EZECH. XVII.

And the word of the Lord came to me, saying: "Son of man, put forth a riddle, and speak a parable to the house of Israel, and say: Thus saith God: A large eagle<sup>1</sup> with great wings, long limbed, full of feathers, and of variety, came to Libanus,<sup>2</sup> and took away the marrow of the cedar. He cropped off the top of the twigs thereof, and carried it away into the land of Chanaan, and he set it in a city<sup>3</sup> of merchants. And he took of the seed of the land, and put it in the ground for seed, that it might take a firm root over many waters; he planted it on the surface<sup>4</sup> of

<sup>1</sup> **A large eagle.** This metaphor is employed frequently in Scripture to describe a successful and rapacious conqueror, flushed with victories and bent on pushing his victorious march rapidly from land to land (cf. Is. xlvi. 11; Jer. xlviii. 40; xlix. 22; Lam. iv. 19; II. Par. xxx. 10). Why the prophet applies it in the present passage to the kings of Babylon and of Egypt is easily understood.

<sup>2</sup> **Libanus.** Jer. xxii. 23 explains why Jerusalem is called Libanus. The most sumptuous edifices of the city were constructed out of cedar wood brought from Mount Lebanon. The cedar itself is a figure of David's royal house; the marrow of the cedar or its top is the ruling Davidic king, in our case Joachin, who had been carried away by Nabuchodonosor (IV. Kings xxiv. 15; II. Par. xxx. 10).

<sup>3</sup> **City of merchants.** Chanaan is the parallel term of the city of merchants. Ezech. xvi. 29 explains why Chanaan is thus represented as containing the city of merchants. Movers (Phœnizier, ii. 3, pp. 239 f.) explains how Babylon can be termed a city of merchants.

<sup>4</sup> **On the surface of the earth.** The Hebrew word corresponding to this clause is a hapax-legomenon; *a.* Vat., Mald., Mar., Calm., Schn., Keil render it "willow," so that the meaning would be: "he planted it like a willow," i.e., that it might grow like a willow over many waters. *b.* The meaning "willow" is rejected by St. Jerome, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, who give the rendering "on the surface of the earth." *c.* The simple Syriac and the Chaldee versions speak about "a vine;" but this rendering too, like that of willow, only mixes the metaphor.

the earth. And it sprung up and grew into a spreading vine of low stature, and the branches thereof looked towards him, and the roots thereof were under him; so it became a vine, and grew into branches, and shot forth sprigs. And there was another large eagle, with great wings, and many feathers, and behold this vine, bending as it were her roots towards him, stretched forth her branches to him, that he might water it by the furrows of her plantation. It was planted in a good ground upon many waters, that it might bring forth branches, and bear fruit, that it might become a large vine. Say thou: Thus saith the Lord God: Shall it prosper then? shall he not pull up the roots thereof, and strip off its fruit, and dry up all the branches it hath shot forth, and make it wither, and this without a strong arm, or many people, to pluck it up by the root? Behold, it is planted: shall it prosper then? Shall it not be dried up when the burning wind shall touch it, and shall it not wither in the furrows where it grew?"

And the Lord came to me, saying: "Say to the provoking house: Know you not what these things mean? Tell them: Behold the king<sup>5</sup> of Babylon cometh to Jerusalem, and he shall take away the king and the princes thereof, and carry them with him to Babylon. And he shall take one of the king's seed, and make a covenant with him, and take an oath of him, yea, and he shall take away the mighty men of the land, that it may be a low kingdom, and not lift itself up, but keep his covenant and observe it. But he hath revolted from him, and sent ambassadors to Egypt, that they might give him horses and much people. And shall he that hath done thus prosper or be saved? and shall he escape that hath broken the covenant? As I live, saith the Lord God: In the place where the king dwelleth that made him king, whose oath he hath made void, and whose covenant he broke, even in the midst of Babylon shall he die. And not with a great army, nor with

<sup>5</sup> **The king of Babylon cometh.** According to the Hebrew text we must render the following verbs in the past tense: "The king of Babylon has come . . . and has taken away . . . and carried them with him . . . and has taken one of the king's seed . . . and made a covenant with him . . . and taken an oath of him." All these historical facts had happened before Ezechiel uttered the present passage, as may be seen in IV. Kings xxiv. 11 f.; Jer. xxiv. 1; xxix. 2; II. Par. xxxvi. 13; IV. Kings xxiv. 14-16; Jer. ii. 18, 36, 37; IV. Kings xxiv. 20; Jer. xxxvii. 5. The name of the Egyptian Pharaoh with whom Sedecias had made his godless alliance was Apries, or according to Manetho, Uachabra (cf. Wiedemann, *Ægypt. Geschichte*, pp. 602, 636).

much people shall Pharaoh fight against him, when he shall cast up mounds and build forts to cut off many souls. For he hath despised the oath, breaking his covenant, and behold he hath given his hand : and having done all these things, he shall not escape." Therefore, thus<sup>6</sup> saith the Lord God : " As I live, I will lay upon his head the oath he hath despised, and the covenant he hath broken. And I will spread my net over him, and he shall be taken in my net, and I will bring him into Babylon, and will judge him there for the transgression by which he hath despised me. And all his fugitives with all his band shall fall by the sword, and the residue shall be scattered into every wind, and you shall know that I the Lord have spoken it."

Thus saith the Lord God : " I myself will take of the marrow of the high cedar, and will set it : I will crop off a tender<sup>7</sup> twig from the top of the branches thereof, and will plant it on a mountain high and eminent. On the high mountain of Israel will I plant it, and it shall shoot forth into branches, and shall bear fruit, and it shall become a great cedar, and all birds shall dwell under it, and every fowl shall make its nest under the shadow of the branches thereof. And all the trees of the country shall know that I the Lord have brought down the high tree, and exalted the low tree, and have dried up the green tree, and have caused the dry tree to flourish. I the Lord have spoken and have done it."

<sup>6</sup> **Thus saith the Lord God.** The city will thus be taken, the king captured and led away, the people killed or dispersed throughout the regions of the civilized world. But on the other hand God had promised Juda and David an everlasting kingdom (Gen. xlix. 10 ; 11. Kings vii. 13, 16 ; Ps. lxxxviii. 4, 38, etc.). Hence God here repeats the manner in which he will fulfil his promises, a description of which he had already given in Jer. xxiii. 5 ; xxxiii. 14, 15, as well as in 11. Kings vii. 14, 15 ; Ps. lxxxviii. 35.

<sup>7</sup> **A tender twig.** The metaphorical expressions of vv. 22-24 have been explained by Christian commentators in two different ways : 1. I will take of the marrow of the cedar, i.e., of David's royal house ; I will crop off a tender twig, i.e., Zorobabel, from the top of the branches thereof, i.e., from among the sons or the nephews of Jeconias ; on the high mountain of Israel will I plant it, and it shall shoot forth into branches and shall bear fruit, and it shall become a great cedar, i.e., the Messianic king will be born of it (Ephr., Prad., Lap., Tir., Gordon, etc.). 2. But other interpreters explain the passage thus : I will take of the marrow of the cedar, i.e., of David's royal family ; I will crop off a tender twig, i.e., the Messiah ; all that follows is then applied to the Messianic king (Theod., Pint., Mald., Sa, Mar., Est., Men., Calm., Loch).

## COROLLARY.

**MESSIANIC CHARACTER OF EZECHIEL'S PROPHECY.**—The Messianic nature of the present prophecy appears 1. from parallel Messianic predictions contained in the Old Testament. The figure of the twig may be compared with the figurative language in Am. ix. 11; Isaias too uses similar metaphors when speaking of the Messiah in iv. 2; xi. 1; liii. 2; cf. vi. 13. 2. The same follows in the second place from several passages which refer to the Messiah in the New Testament. In St. Luke i. 32, 33 it is said that the Lord God will give Christ the throne of his father David, and that Christ will reign in the house of Jacob for ever, and that of his reign there will be no end. Then again we have several parables in which the kingdom of God is compared to the mustard-seed (Matt. xiii. 31; Mark iv. 31; Luke xiii. 19). 3. The Targum distinctly and beautifully refers vv. 22, 23 to the Messiah, so that the Jewish tradition agrees with our interpretation. 4. This reference of the passage to the Messiah, drawn from extrinsic authority, is confirmed by the very extent of the promise. 5. We must notice especially the similarity between the description given of the vine in this passage and in Ps. lxxix.; Mich. iv. 6. Theodoret understands the words "on the high mountain of Israel will I plant it" as referring to Christ's crucifixion on Golgotha (cf. Trochon, *Ezech.* pp. 121 ff.; Knab. in *Ezech.* c. xvii.; Hengst., "Christology," iii. pp. 470 ff.; Briggs, "Messianic Prophecy," p. 270; etc.).





## PART II.

### *BIRTH OF THE MESSIAS.*

---

#### CHAPTER I.

##### PLACE OF THE MESSIAS' BIRTH. MICH. v. 2-14.

##### INTRODUCTION.

**1. CONNECTION OF THE PROPHECY WITH THE PRECEDING ONES.**—It has been shown that the Messiah will be the son of David; Micheas tells us too that he will be of David's royal city. David himself had come forward when his country was heavily afflicted by the inroad of the Philistines; Micheas describes a threefold affliction which is to befall the theocracy, and especially Jerusalem, before the birth of the Messianic restorer. The three woes are announced in iv. 9, 11; v. 1: "Now, why art thou drawn together with grief? hast thou no king in thee, or is thy counsellor perished, because sorrow hath taken thee as a woman in labor? . . . And now many nations are gathered together against thee, and they say: Let her be stoned, and let our eye look upon Sion. . . . Now shalt thou be laid waste, O daughter of the robber; they have laid siege against us, with a rod shall they strike the cheek of the judge of Israel." It is true that interpreters have explained these three distinct woes as applying to various misfortunes.

*a.* St. Cyril's opinion that the woes referred to Samaria is hardly tenable at present. *b.* There is nearly a general agreement that the first affliction refers to the Babylonian captivity (606 B.C.); in fact, Babylon is expressly mentioned in the context. Diversity of opinion regards chiefly the second and third predictions. *c.* Several authors understand the second prediction as applying to Sennacherib (Lap., Menochius, Tir., Gordon). This explanation agrees well with the words following the second prediction, "he hath gathered them together as the hay of the floor." Isaiah's (xxxvii. 36 ff.) description of Sennacherib's defeat corresponds well with such an explanation. But *d.* the words that follow in Micah do not harmonize with this view. "Arise and tread, O daughter of Sion, for I will make thy horn iron . . ." is a command that implies active resistance and personal victory on the part of Sion, while in Sennacherib's case Jerusalem had no active part in the king's destruction. *B.* Then again, if the first prediction applies to the captivity (606 B.C.), and the second to Sennacherib (714 B.C.), the prophetic description goes chronologically backwards; but in this process the third prophecy would hardly find any fit application. For if we were to understand the third prophetic woe of Sennacherib's defeat (588 B.C.) on account of the words "with a rod shall they strike the cheek of the judge of Israel" (Ephrem, Rib., Sanct.), we should have to suppose that the prophet had made chronological retrogressions. *d.* It seems therefore more probable that the second prophecy refers to the Israelite afflictions in the time of the Machabees and of Antiochus Epiphanes (c. 166 B.C.), while the third prediction may apply to the Roman inroads under Pompey (c. 64 B.C.) and those leaders who finally destroyed the royal city Jerusalem (c. 70 A.D.). But however we may understand the threefold woe which precedes Micah's prophecy, it is certain that the Messianic restorer will be born in extremely troublous times, so that David's birth is a perfect type of the Messianic birth.

**2. ANTI-CHRISTIAN EXPLANATION OF MICHEAS' PROPHECY.**—*A.* Grotius and a number of Jewish interpreters explain the prophecy as referring to Zorobabel alone. *a.* Zorobabel really was "a ruler in Israel." *b.* Zorobabel's "going forth is from the beginning" (536 B.C.), since he began his political course from the time of the captivity. *c.* Zorobabel really brought back to the Lord "the remnant of his brethren," leading them out of the Babylonian captivity to the promised land of Chanaan. *d.* Finally, Zorobabel may in a manner be said to have come forth from Bethlehem, since he was of the royal family of David. These reasons are easily answered. *α.* If Zorobabel may be said to be born in Bethlehem because he descends from David's family, Moses may be said to be born in the Ur of the Chaldees because his ancestors lived there. The very name "Zorobabel" indicates that Babylon is the real birth-place of the hero. *β.* Nor does Zorobabel's birth date back to the days of eternity, even though the period of his life coincides with the Hebrew restoration from the Babylonian captivity. *γ.* As to the "remnant" which he led back to the city of God, that expression has commonly a meaning extending beyond the mere temporal welfare of the nation or any of its parts; *δ.* and as to the office of ruler which was held by Zorobabel, it answers in no manner to the glorious description of Micheas, according to which he shall "be magnified even to the ends of the earth."

*B.* We must add, however, that some Catholics, Theodore of Mopsuestia and Barhebraeus among the number, apply Micheas' prophecy to Zorobabel in a literal sense, while in its typical sense they apply it to the Messiah. This view, and another in which the prophecy has an initial fulfilment in Zorobabel, but finds its full accomplishment in the Messiah, may be safely defended, though it appears less probable than the explanation which applies the prediction wholly and entirely to the coming of Christ.

*C.* Another rationalistic interpretation contends that the prophecy must be understood not of any real and personal

but of an ideal Messias. This view has no special grounds in the text of the prophet; and, hypothesis as it is, it will be sufficiently refuted by the testimonies which we shall cite for the existence of a Jewish tradition concerning the Messianic interpretation of the prophecy.

**3. MESSIANIC CHARACTER OF THE PROPHECY.**—*a.* The New Testament is very explicit in applying the prophecy to the Messias' birth: the chief priests and the scribes answered Herod when he inquired about the birth-place of the Messias in the words of Micheas: "And thou Bethlehem the land of Juda . . ." (Matt. ii. 6). Again, we read in Jo. vii. 42 the expressions of the populace gathered for the feast at Jerusalem: "Doth not the Scripture say that Christ cometh of the seed of David, and from Bethlehem, the town where David was?" *b.* From the New Testament passages thus far cited we may immediately infer the existence of a Jewish tradition that the Messias was to be born at Bethlehem. For as Matthew testifies to this belief existing among the priests and scribes, so does John bear witness to its presence among the common people. The Chaldee paraphrase of Mich. v. 2 shows the same fact. For it reads: "Out of thee shall come forth unto me the Messias, that he may exercise dominion in Israel." Micheas v. 3 is also referred to the Messias in the Talmud (Sanhedrin, fol. 98, col. 2): Rab said: "The son of David will not come until the ungodly kingdom has spread itself for a period of nine months over Israel [Yoma, fol. 10, col. 1, reads "over the whole world" for "over Israel"]; for it is said: Therefore will he give them up . . ." A similar Messianic explanation is given of Mich. v. 5 in the Midrash on the Song of Solomon, viii. 10: "Rabbi Simeon, the son of Yochai, has taught: When you see a Persian horse tied to the graves of the land of Israel, expect the footsteps of the Messias. What is the reason? And this man shall be the peace . . . And who are the seven shepherds? In the midst is David; Adam, Seth, Mathusala to his right, and Abraham, Jacob, and Moses to his left. And where

went Isaac? He went and sat down at the gate of hell, to save his children from the judgment of hell; and the eight principal men are: Jesse, Saul, Samuel, Amos, Sophonias, Ezechias, Elias, and the king Messiah." Pesachim, fol. 54, and Gedarim, fol. 39, agree with the above passages of the Talmud in interpreting the prophecy of Micheas in a Messianic sense. Kimchi, Rashi, and Abarbanel too agree with this same explanation. *c.* We hardly need to say that all the Fathers who have touched this prophecy at all refer it to the Messiah, at least in its typical sense (cf. Reinke, "Mess. Weissag.," iii. pp. 349-364). Theodore of Mopsuestia, who was condemned by Pope Vigilius, is the only one to agree partially with Grotius and the Jewish commentators. *d.* Finally, the other Messianic predictions fully agree with that of Micheas. In proof of this we may point to II. Kings vii. 14; Ps. ii.; xlv.; Is. vii. 14; ix. 7, etc.

#### MICH. v. 2-14.

And thou, Bethlehem <sup>1</sup> Ephrata, art a <sup>2</sup> little one among the thou-

<sup>1</sup> **Bethlehem Ephrata.** The whole passage may be divided into the following parts: 1. Israel will be given up until the appearance of the ruler (v. 1-3); 2. then will Israel dwell securely, since capable men will be there to ward off danger, and the Assyrian will be triumphantly repelled (vv. 4-6); 3. the remnant of Jacob will be like beneficent dew for those nations that welcome it, but like a fierce lion for those that resist it (vv. 7-9); 4. the warlike implements will be destroyed, idolatry with its consequences will disappear (vv. 10-14). Ephrata is added here to Bethlehem, not seemingly to distinguish it from the Bethlehem of Zabulon, which is only once named (Jos. xix. 15), and from which it is sufficiently distinguished by the clause "art a little one among the thousands of Juda" (this latter occurs also in Judges xvii. 7-9; xix. 1, 2, 18; Ruth i. 1, 2; I. Kings xvii. 12); but the addition seems to allude either to the former birth of sorrow near Ephrata (Gen. xxxv. 19; xlviii. 7), or to the literal meaning of the name. For as Bethlehem means "house of bread," so Ephrata signifies "fruitfulness."

<sup>2</sup> **Art a little one among the thousands of Juda.** The tribes were divided into thousands, probably of fighting men, each thousand having its separate head (Num. i. 16; x. 4). This division continued even after Israel had settled in Palestine (Jos. xxii. 21, 30; I. Kings x. 19; xxiii. 23). Places too small to form a thousand by themselves were united with others to make up the number, as in I. Par. xxiii. 11;

sands of Juda: out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to

four brothers, not having many sons, were counted as one family or house (Hengst.). As to Bethlehem, it is not mentioned among the possessions of Juda, and in the division under Josue it is wholly omitted (Jos. xv.; the LXX. interpolate it in Jos. xv. 59). From its situation Bethlehem can never have been a considerable place; by its site it is rather calculated to be an outlying fortress guarding the approach to Jerusalem than a populous city. It was fortified and held by the Philistines in the time of Saul (II. Kings xxiii. 15), recovered from them by David, and was one of the fifteen cities fortified by Roboam (II. Par. xi. 6). Its inhabitants were counted with those of the neighboring Netophathi, both before and after the Captivity (I. Par. ii. 54; II. Esdr. vii. 26); but both together amounted after the Captivity to only 179 or 188 men (I. Esdr. ii. 21, 2; II. Esdr. 7, 26). Even at that late period it does not appear among the possessions of Juda (II. Esdr. xi. 25-30). It is called a village (Jo. vii. 42), a strong spot (Joseph. Ant. V. ii. 8), a city (Ruth i. 19; I. Esdr. ii. 1, 21; II. Esdr. vii. 6, 26); but the name "city" applied even to places which had only 100 fighting men (Am. v. 3). In the prophecy Bethlehem is contrasted with the royal city which would become a den of thieves.

A more serious difficulty is presented by the discrepancy between this passage of Micheas and its repetition in Matt. ii. 4-6. For the Evangelist has it: "And thou Bethlehem the land of Juda art not the least among the princes of Juda." The principal solutions of this difficulty may be reduced to the following:

*a.* Pococke employs much learning and ingenuity to establish a verbal agreement between the Prophet and the Evangelist (Notæ miscell. on the Porta Mosis, Works, i. 134-135). He follows Abulwalid, R. Tanchum, and a Heb. Arab. Gloss. in supposing that the Hebrew word which is rendered "a little one" in Micheas' prophecy has also the opposite sense of "great," and that it actually has this meaning in Jer. xlviii. 4; Soph. xiii. 7. Parallel instances are found in the words signifying "holy," "soul," "bless," "insight." But, *α.* it is false that the Hebrew word has the meaning "great" in the two passages indicated. *β.* Again, even if the Hebrew word had the meaning "great" as well as "little," the substitution of "great" instead of "little" in the prophecy of Micheas does not make Micheas agree with Matthew. For the prophecy thus emended would mean: "And thou Bethlehem Ephrata art too great to be among the thousands of Juda."

*b.* Another solution of the difficulty resulting from the discrepancy between the Evangelist and the Prophet is based on the Chaldee, the Syriac, the Septuagint, and the Latin versions—the Latin one being found in St. Augustine (de Civ. Dei, xviii. 30). The prophecy must then be rendered: "It is little that thou shouldst be." But, *α.* even this rendering does not establish a verbal agreement between the prophecy and the Gospel. *β.* Besides, ܠܬܝܢܐ is not used in this meaning, but ܠܬܝܢܐ or ܠܬܝܢܐ (Is. xlix. 6), or ܠܬܝܢܐ (II. Kings vii. 19); and *γ.* finally, in this clause the person spoken of is always expressed.

*c.* Pusey agrees with another class of scholars, who propose the fol-



be the ruler in Israel, and his<sup>a</sup> going forth is from the beginning,

lowing way of solving the difficulty : *α.* St. Matthew relates how the chief priests and scribes, in their answer to Herod's inquiry where Christ should be born, alleged this prophecy. The Evangelist did not correct their answer, which gives the substance rather than the exact words of Micheas ; for this modal discrepancy between prophecy and quotation does not affect the object for which the prediction had been quoted. *β.* Both descriptions of Bethlehem are true : the prophet speaks of it as it was in the sight of men ; the chief priests spoke of it as it was in the sight of God, and as it should become by the birth of the Messias. Still, it must seem strange that the chief priests and scribes, who are always represented as knowing the Law and the Prophets by heart, make such a change in quoting Micheas.

*δ.* It seems, therefore, necessary to add another consideration to the last solution of the question. The chief priests' answer is nothing but a clear rendering of what the prophet had foretold implicitly and obscurely. There is then no difference of meaning between the gospel and the prophecy ; the difference between them affects only the manner in which the prediction is expressed (cf. Knab., Pusey, Rib., Sanct.).

<sup>3</sup> **His going forth is from the beginning.** In the preceding clause the prophet says, "out of thee (Bethlehem) shall he come forth ;" lest any one should think that the predicted ruler would have a temporal beginning, the inspired author now adds : "his going forth is from the beginning," i.e., not from the beginning in which God created the heavens and the earth, but "from the days of eternity." It must be confessed that the mere letter of the Hebrew text does not necessarily say : "from eternity ;" it may mean : "from very remote antiquity." 1. But in the light of further revelation we know that Christ had only two goings forth : one temporal, in Bethlehem : one eternal, from the bosom of his heavenly Father. Now the temporal birth of Christ is represented in this prophecy as still future ; therefore the present clause, which speaks of Christ's birth as past, must apply to his eternal generation. Christian interpreters are therefore right in maintaining that the Hebrew expressions "from the beginning," "from the days of eternity" in our prophecy refer to eternity in its strict sense (cf. Corluy, Spiel. l. p. 443 ; Pusey, p. 70 ; Knabenb., in h. l., p. 442).

2. But even the Jews could in a way understand the words of Micheas as referring to eternity in its strict sense ; for they could know from other prophecies that the future Messias was to be God (Ps. ii. 7 ; Is. ix. 6 ; Ps. xlv. 7 ; cix. 3). Still, the phrase containing either both its members or only one of them occurs at times in the meaning of "remote antiquity" (cf. Mich. vii. 14, 20 ; Is. li. 9), though in Prov. viii. 23 it signifies "eternity" in the strict meaning of the word. 3. Hence, St. Jerome explains our passage now of the eternal generation of the son, now of the son's temporal manifestation in the utterances of the prophets. 4. St. Cyril indicates a triple "going forth" of the Messias : *a.* his eternal generation ; *b.* his incarnation ; *c.* his eternal predefinition as Saviour and Redeemer of the world. 5. Keil

from the days of eternity. Therefore <sup>4</sup> will he give them up till the time wherein she <sup>5</sup> that travaileth shall bring forth, and the and Trochon understand the "going forth" as signifying the divine operations by means of which especially the angel of the Lord has been manifested. But they cannot show that the Hebrew expression ever has such a meaning, since in Sacred Scripture the "going forth" of God does not mean his operation. 6. Jahn, Schegg, and other modern writers explain the "going forth" of the Messiah *a.* as indicating the antiquity and the nobility of his family, or *b.* as signifying his ancient and innumerable titles to his kingship. But *a.* the expression, whether in the original or in the versions, does not convey the idea of any title to royalty; and *b.* as to the antiquity and nobility of the family of the Messiah, the family of David and the tribe of Juda are not more ancient than the other tribes and families of Israel. 7. The Chaldee paraphrase regards "eternity" as one of the Messianic names; but even according to this view we must again inquire whether the name is taken in its strict sense or in the wider acceptance. 8. The patristic testimonies in which the passage is explained as referring to the son's eternal generation may be seen in Rib. and Sanct.

<sup>4</sup> **Therefore will he give them up.** The Hebrew text of this passage is rendered by some authors as meaning "therefore will he keep them," i.e., not permit them to be destroyed (Jerome, Theod., Rib., Sanct., Sa, Mar., Tir.). But *a.* it must be granted that the Hebrew phrase has generally the meaning of "giving over" or "surrendering" something or some one (Jud. xi. 9; 1. Kings viii. 46; xiv. 16; II. Par. xxx. 7, etc.; cf. Ges. Thesaur., p. 926). *b.* Besides this, the context requires the meaning of surrendering in the present passage; for the calamity is distinctly foretold to last till the advent of the Messiah.

<sup>5</sup> **She that travaileth shall bring forth.** Explanations: 1. She that travaileth is the Church (Jerome, Theodoret). For *a.* the Church is addressed in Is. liv. 1: "Give praise, O thou barren that bearest not" (cf. Luke xxiii. 29; Gal. iv. 27); *b.* again, by the travailing of the Church shall the remnant of his brethren be converted to the children of Israel. 2. She that travaileth is the collection of the Gentiles united with Christ, from which union many children will be born to the Messiah (Rib., Mar.) 3. Babylon is she that travaileth, for to Babylon will the Israelites be given up, and when that power will open its womb and free its captives, then will the remnant return to its promised land (Cahnet).

But *a.* it must be noted that in all these explanations the prophet should have rather said: "Till the time wherein she that is barren shall bring forth." *b.* Besides, there is no sufficient connection between any of the three events and the promised Redeemer to make them fit into the prediction. *c.* And finally, these meanings do not suit the context; since the transition to the words "she that travaileth shall bring forth" is so abrupt, there must be question of a well-known manner of speech. Now it is clear that this well-known phrase applied either to Sion (Mich. iv. 9, 10), or to the mother of the Messiah (Mich. v. 2; Is. vii. 14). The preceding explanations are therefore excluded.

remnant of his brethren shall be converted to the children of Israel.

And he <sup>6</sup> shall stand, and feed in the strength of the Lord, in

4. She that travaileth cannot be Sion, because : *a.* According to the context the phrase cannot be a mere figure for the end of the travail ; for then the passage would mean : " He shall give them up until he cease to give them up." *b.* Besides, Sion is spoken of in an unfigurative sense before and after the present passage, so that we cannot have recourse to a figurative meaning in our explanation without breaking with the context. *c.* And finally, in Sacred Scripture " travail " taken figuratively means suffering and sorrow, not the joy following the suffering. *d.* Hence, there is question in our passage of a real bringing forth of an individual or a collection of individuals. *α.* Though Is. lxvi. 8 represents Sion as bringing forth a new nation, Micheas cannot refer to such a birth in the present passage, since he speaks of an individual immediately before and after the phrase " she that travaileth shall bring forth." For there is question of his " going forth," which in Hebrew implies birth, and of " his brethren ;" both clauses refer to " the ruler in Israel." Hence, the bringing forth too must refer to the birth of the ruler in Israel. *β.* But Sion is nowhere spoken of as bringing forth the Messias.

It follows, therefore : 5. that she that travaileth is the mother of the Messias. With this explanation the whole passage becomes clear ; since the Messias must be born in Bethlehem, which is an insignificant village in Juda, his family must be reduced to poverty and obscurity before the time of his birth ; but this cannot happen if the theocracy remains intact, if David's house continues to flourish ; " therefore will he give them up till the time wherein she that travaileth shall bring forth " (Ephr., Cyr., Theoph., Alb., Lap., Men., Tir., Hitz., Schegg, Keil, Trochon, Reinke, Loch, Corluy, Knabenb., Pusey, etc.).

<sup>6</sup> And he shall stand. The rest of Micheas' prophecy describes the consequences of the ruler's going forth. 1. The first of these has been indicated in the last words of the preceding paragraph. " The remnant of his brethren shall be converted," which conversion is according to the Hebrew text represented by their return to the children of Israel in the promised land. 2. The second Messianic blessing consists in the Israelites' peaceful dwelling in the promised land (which is a type of all spiritual blessings). The phrase " they shall be converted " (in verse 4) must be rendered " they shall abide, or dwell." Even against Assyria, the most terrible of Israel's enemies, the Messias will raise up an abundance of defenders (seven and eight, spiritual and temporal defenders), who will easily repel any hostile attacks. 3. The third Messianic blessing will consist in Israel's beneficent influence on all nations that are friendly to it, and in its destructive power against all nations (Gentiles) hostile to it. 4. The fourth Messianic blessing includes several particulars : *a.* The war implements and the fortified places of the promised land will be destroyed, so that every reminder of a destructive war will be removed. *b.* All sorceries and divinations will cease, every one confiding in the guidance of Israel's Messianic ruler. *c.* All the groves

the height of the name of the Lord his God ; and they shall be converted, for now shall he be magnified even to the ends of the earth. And this man shall be our peace, when the Assyrian shall come into our land, and when he shall set his foot in our houses, and we shall raise against him seven shepherds, and eight principal men. And they shall feed the land of Assyria with the sword, and the land of Nemrod with the spears thereof ; and he shall deliver us from the Assyrian when he shall come into our land, and when he shall tread in our borders.

And the remnants of Jacob shall be in the midst of many peoples as a dew from the Lord, and as drops upon the grass, which waiteth not for man, nor tarrieth for the children of men. And the remnant of Jacob shall be among the Gentiles in the midst of many peoples as a lion among the beasts of the forest, and as a young lion among the flocks of sheep, who when he shall go through and tread down, and take, there is none to deliver. Thy hand shall be lifted up over thy enemies, and all thy enemies shall be cut off.

“ And it shall come to pass in that day,” saith the Lord, “ that I will take away thy horses out of the midst of thee, and will destroy thy chariots. And I will destroy the cities of thy land, and will throw down all thy strong holds, and I will take away sorceries out of thy hand, and there shall be no divinations in thee. And I will destroy thy graven things, and thy statues out of the midst of thee, and thou shalt no more adore the works of thy hands. And I will pluck up thy groves out of the midst of thee, and will crush thy cities. And I will execute vengeance in wrath and in indignation among all the nations that have not given ear.”

#### COROLLARIES.

1. The Messiah will not only be of David's royal family (11. Kings vii. 14, etc.), but he will also be born in David's native city.

2. The Messiah will, however, be distinct from David, in having another birth besides the temporal one—a going forth from the beginning, from the days of eternity.

and temples of idol-worship will disappear, so that all will be loyal to the God of Israel. *d* Even the Gentiles who have not yielded obedience to the Messianic king will be crushed, so that Israel will dwell securely.

3. As David came forth from Bethlehem to take away the reproach of Israel and free his nation from the Philistines, so shall the Messiah come forth from Bethlehem to free his people from its most bitter enemies, the dreaded Assyrians, and to lead it back into the land of promise and of divine appointment.

4. This liberation of Israel from the Assyrians is to take place when she that travaileth shall bring forth; Micheas thus well interprets the prophecy of Isaias that treats of the Virgin Mother.

## CHAPTER II.

## THE TIME OF THE MESSIAS' BIRTH.

## Section I. The Blessing of Juda.

Gen. xlix. 8-12.

## INTRODUCTION.

1. **TIME AND OCCASION OF THE PROPHECY.**—Noe before his death pointed out the family of Sem as the bearer of the Messianic blessings. The Semites probably kept the knowledge and love of the true God sufficiently till the time of Abraham, when it became necessary to select one branch of Sem's descendants as the chosen people. Abraham was so thoroughly impressed with the necessity of this step that he sent away all his children except Isaac, whom he recognized as the mediator of the future Redeemer. In the same manner did Isaac impart the peculiar patriarchal blessing to only one of his sons, Jacob, so that Esau was excluded from the chosen people of God. When we keep these facts in view it seems astonishing that the dying Jacob does not select any one of his sons and make him exclusively the chosen Messianic instrument, but blesses all his sons as the fathers of the chosen people of God. In place of Joseph he substitutes his two eldest sons, Ephraim and Manasses.

It is also worthy of note that the order in which the sons' blessings are described follows on the whole the natural grouping of Jacob's family. First are mentioned the six sons of Lia; then follows Dan, the son of Rachel's slave, Bala; next come Gad and Aser, the sons of Lia's slave,



Zelpha; and these are followed by Bala's second son, Nephthali, and Rachel's own children, Joseph and Benjamin (Gen. xxx.). The first three sons, Ruben, Simeon, and Levi, have given their father cause for sorrow and reproof: Ruben by his illicit intercourse with Bala (Gen. xxxv. 22), and Simeon and Levi by their cruel vengeance on the inhabitants of Sichem (Gen. xxxiv. 14 ff.). Thus Juda, the fourth son, becomes the bearer of the Messianic promises.

**2. PLACE OF THE PROPHECY IN THE CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF GENESIS.**—Driver (Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, New York, 1892, pp. 16 ff.) ascribes Gen. xlix. 1-28 to J. Later on the same author illustrates the distinction between P and JE, and in particular between J and P, by the blessings and promises that form such a conspicuous feature in Genesis. The series of promises ascribed to P is contained in Gen. i. 28-30 (Adam); ix. 1-7 (Noe); xvii. 6-8 (Abraham); xxviii. 3 f. and xxxv. 11 f., quoted in xlviii. 3 (Jacob). To JE belong iii. 15 (the Protevangelium); ix. 26 (Sem); xii. 1-3 (Abraham); xiii. 14-17; xv. 5, 18; xviii. 18; xxii. 15-18; xxvi. 2-5, 24 (Isaac); xxvii. 27-29; xxviii. 13-15 (Jacob); xlix. 10 (Juda). The promises ascribed to P are said to be cast in the same phraseology, and to express frequently the same thought, while those assigned to J show a greater variety, and even the features which they have in common are entirely different from the qualities that characterize the promises ascribed to P. In the latter prophecies only Israel is concerned, while the predictions assigned to J regard other nations too. However ingeniously this analysis may be made, it can claim nothing beyond the merit of a skilful hypothesis—not, indeed, in the sense of the modern critics, but only in so far as it points out the various sources from which Moses may have written the Book of Genesis.

The other arguments that are usually advanced as proving the spurious character of Jacob's dying blessing may be reduced to the following heads: *a.* It contains manifest references to future events; *b.* such a lofty strain

of poetry and such rich imagery could not have proceeded from a superannuated old man on the brink of the grave; *c.* the blessing promised by Jacob could not have been handed down verbatim to the time of Moses (Heinrichs, Vater, De Wette, Friedrich, Justi, Bleek, etc.). But all these exceptions, though they rest on such great authority, are hardly solid enough to render the authenticity of Jacob's blessing doubtful. *α.* For the first reason supposes *a priori*, as it were, that the foreknowledge of the future is impossible, either because God himself does not know the future or because he cannot make it known to creatures. Both of these assumptions we deny. *β.* As to the second exception, we need only call attention to the fact that Jacob is supposed to have uttered the passage under the influence of divine inspiration, which might easily supply any deficiency in the human instrument. Besides, the simplicity of the patriarchs would naturally tend to render their imagination more vivid and more capable of poetic conception. The Arabian poet Lebid, who reached the age of 157 years, composed a poem even on his death-bed. *γ.* Before the time of "Mohammed" the poets of his country were often called upon to recite long poetic pieces extempore, since the art of writing was at that period not practised among the Arab tribes. The poet Hareth, e.g., recited extempore his "Moallakah," which is still extant, when he was 135 years old. These facts, together with the consideration that before the general introduction of writing man's memory was more faithful because more practised, and that in the case of inspired language the same Spirit who had inspired it would also give power to preserve it, are sufficient answers to the third exception (Hengstenb., Christol. i. p. 51).

**3. MESSIANIC CHARACTER OF THE PROPHECY.**—The Messianic application of Jacob's prophecy concerning Juda appears: 1. In the Apocalypse v. 5: "And one of the ancients said to me: Weep not; behold the lion of the tribe of Juda, the root of David, hath prevailed to open

the book, and to loose the seven seals thereof." The lion of the tribe of Juda is therefore identical with the Messiah; but the same is the subject of Jacob's prediction.

2. Another Messianic note we see in the words of the prophecy, "and he shall be the expectation of the nations." It is true that the Hebrew text reads here: "And to him the obedience of the nations." But in either case the passage contains an evident reference to the Messiah, who is surely the woman's seed that is to crush the serpent's head, and the patriarchal seed in whom all the nations shall be blessed. In all truth, then, may he be called the expectation of the nations. On the other hand, the Messiah is described as the star of Jacob and the sceptre which shall smite the princes of Moab, as the great theocratic king to whom the nations shall belong as his inheritance. He is therefore truly called "he to whom shall be the obedience of the nations" (cf. Ps. lxxxv. (lxxxvi.) 9; Is. ii. 2; Ps. xxi. (xxii.) 28, 29; Is. liii. 10; Agg. ii. 7, 8; Mal. i. 11; Ps. ii. 7, 8; Luke ii. 29-32). Besides all this, Christ himself repeatedly testified of himself that all power had been given him (Matt. xxviii. 18; xxvi. 13; Mark xvi. 15; Rom. xv. 9-12).

3. The Messianic character of Jacob's blessing imparted to Juda is also evident from the tradition of the Samaritans. In the year 1685 Moffaridj, the chief of the Samaritans, wrote to England: "You have spoken about the great prophet of whom the Lord said to Moses: 'I will raise up a prophet. . . . He it is whom the nations will obey.'" Now they openly declared and admitted that this prophet was the Messiah (Hathab). Cf. *Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque du Roi*, t. xii., p. 28, 209; Burgès, *Les Samaritains de Naplouse*, p. 91; *Précis historiques*, 1873, pp. 442-444.

4. Christian tradition too is unanimous in explaining Juda's prophecy of the future Messiah. References to the patristic testimonies are found in Kilber's *Analysis Biblica* (editio altera, Lutetiae Parisiorum, 1856, I. pp. 39 f.).

5. Jewish and Rabbinic tradition is equally pronounced in favor of the Messianic character of Juda's prediction.

*a. Verse 10.* The Targum Onkelos has the paraphrase: "Until that Messiah shall come whose is the kingdom." The Jerusalem Targum renders: "Until the time that king Messiah shall come whose is the kingdom." The Targum Jonathan reads: "Until the time that king Messiah the youngest of his children shall come." The Midrash Bere-shith Rabba (sect. 98, 99), the Midrash Echa (i.e., on Lament. i. 16), refer the expression Shiloh to the Messiah. That Shiloh was regarded as the name of the Messiah is attested by the following Talmudic passage (Sanhedrin, fol. 98, col. 2): "What is his name? They of the school of Rab Shila said: His name is Shiloh, as it is written, Until Shiloh come. But those of the school of Rabbi Yanai said: His name is Yinon, as it is said, Before the sun was, his name was Yinon (Ps. lxxii. 17). They of the school of Hanina said: Hanina is his name, as it is said, Where I will not show you favor (Jer. xvi. 13). And some say: His name is Menachem, the son of Ezechias, as it is said, Because he keeps far from me the Comforter, who refreshes my soul (Lam. i. 16). The Rabbis say: His name is the leper of the house of Rabbi, as it is said, Surely he hath borne our sickness, and endured the burden of our pains, yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God and afflicted" (Is. liii. 4). Bere-shith Rabba (sect. 99) gives a Messianic meaning to the words. And he shall be the expectation of the nations: "The same is meant to whom the prophecy refers, And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people" (Is. xi. 10).

*b. Verse 11* is also explained Messianically. The Jerusalem Targum says: "How fair is King Messiah, who is hereafter to arise from the house of Juda! He girdeth up his loins, and goes forth to battle against his foes, smiting kings with their princes, reddening their rivers with the blood of their slain, and whitening his valleys with the

fatness of their strength; his garments are dipped in blood; he is like to the treader of grapes." The Targum Jonathan speaks almost in the same words. Bereshith Rabba (sect. 99) remarks on the words, And his ass, O my son, to the vine: "This refers to him of whom it is said, Lowly and riding upon an ass" (Zach. ix. 9). In the Talmud (Berachoth, fol. 57, col. 1) it is said: "Whoever sees a vine in his dream will see the Messias, because it is written, And his ass, O my son, to the vine." Bereshith Rabba (98) explains the words, He shall wash his robe in wine, as meaning the teaching of the law to Israel, and those other words, His garment in the blood of the grape, as signifying that he would bring them back from their errors. One of the Rabbis, however, expresses the opinion that Israel would not require to be taught by the king Messias in the latter days, since it was written (Is. xi. 10): Him the Gentiles shall beseech. If this be so, why will the Messias come, and what will he do to the congregation of Israel? He will redeem Israel, and give them thirty commandments, according to Zacharias xi. 12. Thus far then the Messianic application of Jacob's prophecy is clearly contained in Rabbinic tradition.

*c. Verse 12.* The Jerusalem Targum renders what is translated in our version "his eyes are more beautiful than wine" in this manner. "How fair are the eyes of King Messias to look upon! more beautiful than the vine, purer than to behold with them the uncovering of nakedness, and the shedding of innocent blood; his teeth are more skilful in the law than to eat with them deeds of violence and rapine." The Targum Jonathan almost verbally agrees with this rendering. In verse 18 the Messianic application of verse 12 is repeated, although not in express words.

*d. Verse 9.* The expression "lion's whelp" is applied to the Messias in Yalkut (160) no less than five times; Bereshith Rabba (98) refers also the term "thou hast couched" to the Messias. If further argument were needed to show

that Rabbinic tradition interprets Jacob's blessing of Juda Messianically, we might refer to the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan and Bereshith Rabba (98) on verse 1 of Gen. xlix. The Targum notes that the end for which the Messiah would come was not revealed to Jacob, while the Midrash says of Jacob and Daniel (xii. 4) that they saw the end, and that it was afterwards hid from them.

GEN. XLIX. 8-12.

<sup>1</sup> Juda, thee shall thy brethren praise,  
 Thy hand shall be on <sup>2</sup> the necks of thy enemies,  
 The sons of thy father shall bow down to thee.  
 Juda is a <sup>3</sup> lion's whelp,  
 To the prey my son thou art gone up ;  
 Resting thou hast couched as a lion,  
 And as a lioness, who shall rouse him ?

<sup>1</sup> **Juda.** When Lia brought forth Juda, she said : Now will I praise the Lord, and therefore she called his name Juda (Gen. xxix. 35). Jacob alludes to this primitive meaning of Juda's name, implying only that Juda's brethren would take up the strain of Lia's praise. His noble behavior at the time when his brethren sold Joseph (xxxvii. 22, 26), and again when Benjamin was in apparent danger (xliv. 18-34) rendered him worthy to be preferred to the incestuous Ruben and the cruel Levi and Simeon.

<sup>2</sup> **On the necks of thy enemies.** Juda is to be victorious over his enemies and the leading tribe in Israel, his brethren being obliged to do him homage. Juda's elevation to be the royal tribe, and David's signal victories over his enemies fulfilled these two promises, partially at least, while both obtained their final accomplishment in the victory and the royal dignity of the Messiah.

<sup>3</sup> **A lion's whelp.** Juda is thus compared with the most powerful and the most royal of beasts—with the lion retiring to the mountains after devouring his prey. The standard of the tribe of Juda was a lion, and was probably adopted in accordance with this prophecy. We need not notice the opinion of several Rabbinic writers that Juda intended to retire on hearing the evil predictions which Jacob uttered regarding his three oldest sons, but that the dying father retained him, and broke forth into the present strain of favorable predictions. Others again maintain that Juda had made a confession of his intercourse with Thamar (Gen. xxxviii.), and that his father praised and blessed him on account of his sincere penitence and humility.

<sup>4</sup> **The sceptre.** The verb following "sceptre," as it stands in the Hebrew text, means either "shall not depart" or "shall not be wanting." The context determines which of these significations is preferable. Now in the context we read the noun "shebeth," which



The 'sceptre shall not be taken away from Juda,  
Nor 'a ruler from 'his thigh,

signifies either "tribe" or "sceptre." Hence we have the two different renderings: "a tribe descending from Juda shall not be wanting," and "a sceptre shall not depart from Juda."

Patrizi defends the former of these two renderings for the following reasons: 1. The Hebrew word "shebeth" occurs 160 times in the meaning "tribe," only 40 times in the signification of "sceptre." 2. In the very chapter to which our prophecy belongs, "shebeth" signifies twice "tribe" (vv. 16, 28); hence it is probable that it has the same meaning in v. 10. 3. The fulfilment of the prophecy becomes clearer if we translate "shebeth" by "tribe" than if we render it by "sceptre." For the distinction between the Jewish tribes has been forgotten long ago. 4. If we translate "tribe" we obtain a beautiful climax in the context, which is lost if we give the other meaning to "shebeth." 5. If we render "royal sceptre," the prophecy does not predict anything that is peculiar to Juda (cf. Gen. xlix. 28), since the royal power has belonged to the other tribes of Israel as well as to Juda. 6. St. Basil prefers the rendering "tribe" to that of "sceptre" (ad. Amphiloeh. ep. 236, al. 391).

But *a.* it cannot be denied that the authority of only one Father in a matter so much disputed as the present passage is of very little weight. *b.* On the other hand, the climax of the passage is not entirely lost, even if we translate "shebeth" by "sceptre." For the words "from his thigh" add clearness and emphasis to the preceding line. However, we cannot assume *a priori* that the passage must have such a climax. *c.* As to the frequency of "shebeth's" meaning "tribe," we fully grant the fact, but deny that therefore "shebeth" must have always such a signification, even where the context calls for another meaning. *d.* Though other tribes too have wielded the royal power in Israel, Juda has so far outstripped them all that the Jews generally looked upon David and Solomon as ideal representatives of the theocracy. And this power has as completely been taken away from Juda as the distinction between the different tribes has disappeared.

Since then Card. Patrizi's arguments are not altogether unanswerable, we may add a few positive reasons why the rendering "sceptre" should be preferred to that of "tribe." 1. The LXX. renders "ruler," Aquilas "sceptre," Symmachus "royal power," Onkelos "one exercising power," Jonathian "kings and princes," the Jerusalem Targum "kings," the Arabian version "rod;" the Syriac and the Samaritan versions are ambiguous in their renderings, but they do not favor the meaning "tribe" to the exclusion of the signification "sceptre." 2. The context of our passage favors the rendering "sceptre" rather than "tribe." For its parallel term is rendered "ruler." 3. We must also call attention to the similar passages Num. xxiv. 17 and Zach. x. 11, in which "shebeth" is translated "rod" or "sceptre." 4. If "shebeth" is rendered "tribe," we must translate the whole passage "Juda's tribe shall not cease;" but in the Hebrew text we read "the shebeth from Juda," which would be an uncommon construction to express a tribe descending from Juda.

Till <sup>7</sup> he come that is <sup>6</sup> to be sent,

The word "sceptre," originally denoting a staff of wood, a strong rod taken from a tree and peeled as a wand, is used—1. For the rod of correction (Num. xxiv. 17; Is. ix. 4; Ps. cxxiv. (cxxxv.) 3; 11. Kings vii. 14, etc.); 2. For the staff of a shepherd (Lev. xxvii. 32; Ps. xxii. (xxiii.) 4); 3. For the sceptre of royalty (Ps. xlv. (xlvi.) 7; Is. xiv. 5; Ezech. xix. 11; Am. i. 5, 8; Zach. x. 11). This last meaning may be illustrated by 11. 11, 46, 101. In the present passage the meaning which implies or at least signifies the royal power appears to deserve decided preference.

<sup>5</sup> **Nor a ruler.** The term "ruler," in Hebrew מֶלֶךְ (mechoqeq), is parallel to the term "sceptre." Considered grammatically, it is the participle Poel of the verb קָקַךְ, and signifies therefore "a legislator" or the legislator's ensign, "a staff of authority." In Deut. xxxiii. 21, where the term "mechoqeq" occurs, its meaning is not clear; in Num. xxi. 18 the meaning "rod" or "staff" is preferable; in Judges v. 14 the term is rightly rendered "princes;" in Is. xxxiii. 22 its meaning "legislator" is the most obvious. In Ps. lix. (lx.) 9 and cvii. (cviii.) 9 the Vulgate renders the term by "leader," but the division of the lines appears to be changed from what it must have been in the original reading. It ought to read: ". . . Ephraim is the strength of my head, Juda is the staff (on which I lean)." Both meanings of "mechoqeq" occur therefore in Sacred Scripture. And since the word is in the present passage parallel to "shebeth," the signification "ruler's staff" seems to be preferable.

We cannot omit to mention that Card. Patrizi offers a number of exceptions to this interpretation. *a.* First, he calls attention to the fact that it is new; *b.* then he insists on the improbability that the same word "mechoqeq" should signify "legislator" and "staff of power." *c.* Besides, the Cardinal does not admit the parallelism between the meaning "ruler's staff" and the preceding "shebeth," since he renders the latter expression by "tribe." *d.* In Num. xxi. 18 he translates "mechoqeq" by legislator, and in Ps. lix. (lx.) 9 he paraphrases the passage: "Ephraim's invincible troops, in whom I fully trust, and supreme leaders of Juda." It must, however, be granted that none of these exceptions creates any great difficulty, so that the foregoing explanation may be safely followed.

<sup>6</sup> **From his thigh.** The Hebrew text reads "from between his feet," "mibben raglav." Hence interpreters disagree regarding the precise meaning of the passage: 1. Some think that the metaphor of the preceding verse is continued in the present, so that we must think of Juda's lion holding the sceptre between his claws. But it seems more natural to end the metaphor with the preceding verse. 2. Others have therefore interpreted the expression as signifying "from his seed" or "from his offspring." *a.* The parallel passage in Deut. xxviii. 57, *b.* as well as the rendering in the Targumim (Onkelos, Jonathan, Jerusalem) favors this explanation. But, on the other hand, *α.* the Hebrew expression commonly expresses contempt when it means "from his seed," while in the present passage it implies the highest blessing; *β.* again, according to this explanation the clause "from between his feet" would have to be referred to the noun

And he shall be the <sup>9</sup>expectation of the nations.

"ruler" or "tribe" rather than to the verb "shall not be taken" or "shall not depart." Now in the preceding paragraph we have shown that the renderings "ruler" and "tribe" are less probable than "sceptre" and "ruler's staff." 3. Interpreters have therefore offered a third explanation, which appears to be more satisfactory than either of the former two. It may be seen in the Assyrian inscriptions that the kings, when seated on the throne, were accustomed to hold their sceptre between their feet. This fact has supplied the dying patriarch with the figure which he applies to Juda.

<sup>7</sup> *Till he come.* The Hebrew conjunction "ad-ki," rendered "till," is composite; Cajetan, with a few others, has interpreted its parts separately, rendering 'ad by "for ever" and ki by "because." Hence we obtain the reading: "the sceptre shall not depart from Juda, nor the ruler's staff from between his feet, for ever, because he shall come that is to be sent . . ." But it must be noted *a.* that in the Hebrew text 'ad is separated from what precedes by Athnach, one of the greatest disjunctive accents; *b.* besides, 'ad is never taken adverbially in any part of the Old Testament, and especially when it accompanies ki it has always the meaning "until." *c.* Cajetan's interpretation has no ancient authority in its favor; for Onkelos adds "for ever" as a mere gloss, since he has immediately after it the common rendering "until."

<sup>8</sup> *That is to be sent.* These words render the Hebrew expression "shiloh," which has exercised the ingenuity of interpreters considerably. The reading "shiloh" (שִׁילֹה) is found in all Hebrew codices, except 40, two of which read "shilov" (שִׁילֹו) and thirty-eight read "shelloh" (שֵׁלֹה). All printed editions of the Hebrew text, excepting one, favor the reading "shiloh." *a.* Judging then from the great care with which the Jews have always been accustomed to guard the text of Scripture, it must be inferred that "shiloh" is the proper reading in the present passage. *b.* The fact that some of the old translations suppose the reading "shelloh" may be explained as a consequence of the great freedom with which they often render the original. *c.* In the present instance they had an additional motive for their free rendering, because Ezech. xxi. 32 suggests the meaning of "shelloh." *d.* Finally, the Hebrew consonantal text should not be changed without the most serious reasons requiring such an emendation. The relative value of these arguments will appear in all its clearness when we shall speak about the reading "shelloh."

Supposing, then, for the present "shiloh" to be the correct reading, it follows—1. that we must look upon the rendering of St. Jerome as defective; for "he that is to be sent" requires in the Hebrew text "shaluach," a reading which rests on no authority. 2. Bickell, Lagarde, Flunk, etc., suppose that "shiloh" is contracted out of "sh'iloh" (שִׁאִלֹה), the Chaldee passive participle followed by the pronominal affix "oh"; hence they rightly translate "his desired one." Though this explanation is new, it does not lack intrinsic or extrinsic probability. 3. The rendering "his son," as if "shiloh

Tying <sup>10</sup> his foal to the vineyard,

consisted of "shil," son, and the pronominal affix "oh" is confined to Ps. Jonathan and a few of his followers, but cannot be defended by any probable argument (cf. Delitzsch, *Neuer Comm.*, p. 519). There is no word "shil" meaning "son" in the Hebrew language. 4. Delitzsch, Kurtz, and the Rationalists generally render "shiloh" "to Silo." According to this view the whole passage reads: "the sceptre shall not be taken from Juda, nor the ruler's staff from between his feet, till he come to Silo." The reasons for this rendering may be reduced to the following: *a.* "Shiloh" usually signifies "Silo," and in 1. Kings iv. 12 (cf. Jos. xviii. 9; Judg. xxi. 12; 1. Kings i. 21-1. Kings iv. 4) we have a passage, almost verbatim parallel to ours, which must be rendered "and he came to Silo;" *b.* till the ark of the Lord was deposited in Silo, Juda held the primacy among the Israelite tribes (cf. Num. i., xxvi.; ii. 3-9; x. 14; vii. 12; Jos. xv. 1, and the history of the earliest kings); *c.* this coming to Silo constitutes such an important event in the Israelite history that it cannot surprise us if it has been the terminus of Jacob's vision (cf. Jos. xviii. 1).

But we find, on the other hand, that very weighty reasons militate against this explanation. *α.* The earliest name of the city was not Silo, but Thaanath, so that Hengstenberg looks upon the name Silo as given to the city in memory of Jacob's prophecy (this is denied by Delitzsch, l. c. pp. 520, 521). *β.* The primacy of Juda till the period indicated was either an honorary one or it was certainly not continuous, since during the same period we find Moses the Levite and Josue the Ephraimite exercising supreme authority. *γ.* Besides the fact that all Jewish and Christian tradition contradicts such an interpretation, it must also be observed that the Chanaanites, who are said to have obeyed Juda, may just as well be represented as obedient to the other tribes of Israel, so that such an obedience means nothing especially favorable to Juda.

5. Others again look upon "shiloh" as a common noun, meaning "quiet," "tranquillity." According to this interpretation we must render the passage: "the sceptre shall not depart from Juda, nor the ruler's staff from between his feet, till tranquillity or peace comes" (cf. 1. Par. xxii. 9; Eph. ii. 14; Is. ix. 5; Mich. v. 5). The reason on which this interpretation rests is based on the analogous derivation of other nouns from verbs; e.g., "kidor" from "kadar." But, on the other hand, it is objected that such forms are derived only from Piel-forms of verbs, and that the verbs שָׁלַח do not admit this manner of noun-formation. In fact, there is a noun "shalvah," meaning "tranquillity" or "quiet," derived from the verb "shalah." The foundation for this last explanation is therefore very weak.

6. The opinion, finally, that "Shiloh" is a proper name of the Messiah has many and solid arguments in its favor. *a.* We have already noted that Jewish tradition favors this view, since three Targumim (Onkelos, Jonathan, Jerusalem), the Midrash Bereshith Rabba (sect. 98, 99), the Midrash Echa (Lam. i. 16), the Talmudic treatise Sanhedrin (fol. 98, col. 2), agree with the later Jewish writers

And his ass, O my son, to the vine,

Jarchi, Moses, and Abarbanel in making Shiloh a name of the Messiah. *b.* Etymologically considered, Shiloh may be explained as a shortened form for Shilon, as Salomoh is a shortened form for Salomon. The form Shilon may then be derived from the verb "shalah," and signify "peaceful." A comparison with Ps. lxxi. (lxxii.) 3, 7; lxxxiv. (lxxxv.) 11; Is. ix. 6; Mich. v. 5; Luke i. 79; Eph. ii. 14, 17; and the striking parallelism existing between Gen. xlix. 8, 10 and Is. xi. 1, 6-10 (Ezech. xxi. 32) render such a view of Shiloh very probable. As to the Samaritans, we must grant the fact that they make Shiloh a proper name of Solomon, the great enemy of the Mosaic law; but, at the same time, they fully agree with us in considering the word as a proper name.

Thus far we have regarded the reading "Shiloh" as the preferable one. But the other principal reading, "shelloh" has also a great many arguments in its favor. *a.* It is found in 38 of de Rossi's codices, and the Hebrew-Samaritan text too is decidedly in its favor. *b.* If we except St. Jerome, all the other ancient versions suppose the reading "shelloh" in their rendering (LXX., Aquilas, Symmachus, the Syriac, Onkelos, the Jerusalem Targum, Abu Said in the Samaritan version, Saadiah in the Arabic rendering). All of these versions suppose the word "shelloh" to consist of the relative "sh," שׁ, the preposition ה, and the pronominal suffix ה; some of them suggest that a word must be supplied. *c.* The following considerations may be added to what has thus far been advanced: *α.* The pronominal suffix ה occurs instead of ו twice in the very context of the prophecy (v. 11), so that the unusual form cannot create any surprise. *β.* The form "sh," שׁ, for the relative pronoun occurs as early as Gen. vi. 3; Judges vi. 17; v. 7, so that the dying patriarch may well have used the same form. Etymologically speaking, "shelloh" presents therefore no unanswerable difficulties. *d.* Nor can it be said that "shelloh" might have easily been written instead of "shiloh" on account of the diminutive size of the letter yodh י; for the letter yodh, as written in the *ancient* Hebrew alphabet, is as large as any of the other consonants. On the other hand, the insertion of yodh into the consonant text is easily explained. It may be looked upon as substituted by an error of the transcriber instead of the Daghesh forte in Lamedh (ל). Jahn has shown that such a transcriber's error is not without parallel (cf. Ps. xxi. (xxii.) 17.) *e.* The Greek Fathers, who follow the LXX. version, together with the old Latin Fathers who use the Itala, favor the reading "shelloh." Similar arguments may be drawn from Gal. iii. 19; Ezech. xxi. 32 (Vulg. 27).

*α.* It is true that the greater number of the Hebrew manuscripts have the reading "shiloh." But it should be kept in mind that the oldest of them does not date beyond the ninth century after Christ. *β.* The exception that the clause "asher lo" (אֲשֶׁר לוֹ) nowhere occurs in Sacred Scripture without having the noun expressed to which the relative refers, is not wholly correct in its statement; for IV. Kings vi. 11 may be considered as an instance to the contrary. *γ.* Finally, the assertion that the reading "shelloh" gives a cold meaning to the passage is wholly unfounded; to describe the Messiah as



He shall wash his robe in wine,

one to whom the sceptre and the ruler's staff belong is surely not to detract from his Messianic prerogatives.

Since the reading "shiloh" is, therefore, at least as probable as the reading "shiloh," we must next inquire into its exact meaning. Concerning this interpreters have differed in opinion: *a.* Many think that something must be supplied before the clause, e.g., "that," or "all," or "he;" hence we obtain the explanations: "until that come which belongs to him," or "until all come that belongs to him," or "until he come who belongs to him." The first of these three meanings is adopted by the LXX. (*τα ἅποκειμενα αὐτῷ*), the second has its parallel in Gen. xxiv. 36; the third may be compared with Cant. i. 6, IV. Kings vi. 11; grammatically considered any one of these three explanations is admissible, though exegetically none of them is desirable on account of the cold and jejune meaning they bear.

*b.* Another explanation supposes that something must be supplied after "shiloh"—either the "sceptre" and the "ruler's staff," or a pronoun referring back to these nouns. According to this view the meaning of the passage is: "until he come to whom sceptre and ruler's staff belong." As to the grammatical construction, it has its parallel in Lev. xxvii. 24; Ezech. xxi. 32. Most of the ancient versions seem to have interpreted the prophecy in this sense, and the prophet Ezechiel must have taken the same view of Jacob's dying words. Besides, this explanation fits in well with the idea of the Messiah, since it describes him as the rightful heir of sceptre and ruler's staff. It thus agrees well with Matt. xxviii. 18; Luke i. 32; Jo. xviii. 37; Ps. ii. 6-9, etc. The poetic setting of Jacob's blessing is well calculated to explain the apparent irregularity of language involved in this explanation (cf. Ps. ii. 9; lxxi. (lxxii.) 2; Luke xxii. 39; I. Cor. xv. 25; Apoc. xix. 13-16).

<sup>9</sup> **The expectation of the nations.** The Heb. text requires that we render either "the gathering of the nations" or "the obedience of the nations." It is clear from Ps. ii. 7, 8, 9; xlv. (xlv.) 3-7; Jo. xviii. 37; Matt. xxviii. 18, 19; Luke i. 32, 33; Matt. i. 20, 21 that this obedience is a spiritual and supernatural obedience. The natural connection of the phrase supposes that this obedience is due to the "Shiloh" of the preceding clause, and not to Juda, though some interpreters refer it to the latter. Wellhausen goes so far as to omit the first words, "and to him," in the Hebrew text; hence he obtains the rendering: "until he come to whom is due the obedience of the nations."

<sup>10</sup> **Tying his foal.** Explanations: 1. The literal sense of these words and of those that follow refers to the fruitfulness of Juda's territory. Resting in unalterable peace, Juda's descendants will tie their beasts of burden to the common vine, and the young ones of their beasts of burden to the choicest kind of vine; wine will be so abundant in Juda that it will be used instead of water, and even the natural features of the children of Juda will be affected by the abundance of wine. Those Catholics who adhere to this explanation apply the prophecy in its typical sense to the Messias. 2. Other Catholics apply the prediction in its literal, though in its metaphorical, sense



And his garment in the blood of the grape.  
His eyes are more beautiful than wine,  
And his teeth whiter than milk.

## COROLLARIES.

1. The exact meaning of the present prophecy depends on the rendering of the Hebrew words "shebeth," "mechoqeq," "ad ki," and on the nature of the obedience promised.

*a.* It follows from our explanation of "shebeth" and "mechoqeq" that whether we take them in the sense of

to the Messiah: *a.* Ephrem, Justin, and Cyril maintain that the clauses "tying his foal . . ." refer to the triumphal entrance of Jesus into Jerusalem (Zach. ix. 9). *b.* Others are of opinion that the vine represents the Synagogue, while the "foal" and the "ass" represent the collection of the Gentiles. Hence Jesus ties his foal to the vine because he has brought the Gentiles to the true faith of the Synagogue. *c.* The "wine and the blood of the grape" are the blood of Christ, while the "robe" and the "garment" are his human nature. The whole clause describes, therefore, the suffering of Jesus Christ for the redemption of the world (Tertullian, Hippolytus, Novatian, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Gaudentius of Brescia, Paulinus, Theodoret, Cyril of Alexand., Isidore Hispal., Photius; cf. Lamy, in Gen. p. 378). *d.* According to others, again, the wine and the blood of the grape have the same meaning as in the preceding passage, while the robe and the garment signify not the human nature of the Word Incarnate, but the Church and the collection of the Gentiles who will be converted to Christ. Thus the passage directly indicates that all the redeemed will be washed in the blood of the lamb (Hippolytus, Ambrose, Isidore, Justin, Origen, Rufinus, Augustine, Athanasius). This explanation appears to have parallel passages in Is. xlix. 18; Isxiii. 1-2; Apoc. xix. 13. Patrizi endeavors to exclude all literal reference of the passage to the land of Juda from the fact that this country was in no way remarkable for its fertility. It may also be added that those who refer the "tying of the foal" to Christ's triumphal entrance into Jerusalem believe either that there was a vine near the temple to which Jesus tied the animal after he had entered the city, or else they think that the beast was tied to a vine when the disciples went to loose him.

<sup>11</sup>His eyes are more beautiful. The words may be rendered either: "His eyes are more beautiful (blacker, more sparkling, redder) than wine, and his teeth whiter than milk" or "his eyes are sparkling (beautiful, etc.) from wine, and his teeth are white from milk." Explanations: 1. The fertility of the land is thus described (Vigouroux); 2. Christ's bodily beauty is thus foretold; 3. Christ's doctrine is thus represented as most attractive and beautiful (Ephrem); 4. the beauty of Christ's body after his resurrection is predicted (Theodoret).

“tribe and ruler,” or in the more probable meaning of “sceptre and ruler’s staff,” they promise in any case political power to the tribe of Juda. We do not grant that this political power means necessarily royal authority ; for the royal dignity ceased in Juda with Jechonias and Sedecias (though it was temporarily revived in Zorobabel), while political influence remained in the tribe till about the time of Christ’s birth. Even during the period of the Babylonian captivity, this power was not entirely taken away, as appears from the trial of Susanna (Dan. xiii. 5). At the later period of the Machabees, of the Asmoneans and the Herodians, the tribe of Juda was so prominent that the whole remaining nation was named after it, and the members of the Sanhedrin were to a great extent taken from its ranks. The tribe’s political importance may be considered as extinct either at the time when Judea became a full Roman province, after the deposition of Archelaus, or, at any rate, after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus.

b. This agrees with the double rendering of which “’ad ki” is susceptible. For whether we understand it as meaning “until,” or in the sense of “for ever, because,” it implies that Juda’s *political* influence is to cease at the coming of the Messias. Though the word “until” does not of itself imply the cessation of the action or of the state to which it refers (cf. Matt. i. 25; Dent. xxxiv. 6), still in the present passage it indicates negatively such a cessation of Juda’s political prominence. For the latter is implied in the following words of the promise. If the acceptation “for ever, because” be preferred, the eternity of Juda’s rule is based on the coming of the Messias, and on his universal rule. Hence, in this case, too, the merely *political* influence of Juda will end with the Messias. All this will happen connectedly, so that Juda’s political power will form the type of which the Messias will be the antitype. The latter is, therefore, truly represented as the lion of Juda’s tribe, who retires to his mountain fastnesses after the cap-

ture of his booty (cf. Apoc. v. 5, 9, 10). The promise made to David (II. Kings vii. 14) is very similar to Juda's promise.

c. It has been stated that instead of the clause "expectation of the nations" we must render, "unto him shall be the obedience of the nations." Most probably the "him" of this clause refers to the preceding "Shiloh," and therefore directly to the Messias. But even if we admit the other possible reference of "him" to Juda, this patriarch is a well-known type of the Messias; and what has been partially fulfilled in Juda will find its final and entire accomplishment in the person of the Messias.

d. This is the more true since the obedience of which Jacob speaks is a spiritual obedience, as may be seen in Ps. ii. 7, 8, 9; xlv. (xlv.) 3-7; Jo. xviii. 37; Matt. xxviii. 18, 19; Luke i. 32, 33; Matt. i. 20, 21. A spiritual obedience was due to the Messias *by right* as soon as a Church was founded which was to embrace in its fold all the nations of the earth (Matt. xxviii. 19; Rom. iii. 22). In point of *fact*, the general obedience of the nations was paid to Christ as soon as the Christian faith was preached to all the peoples of the earth (Rom. x. 18; i. 8).

2. Is the Messias to be of Juda's tribe? The dying patriarch does not state explicitly that the Messias is to descend from his son Juda. But if the whole context of the prediction be considered, this privilege is at least implicitly foretold in Jacob's blessing. For the whole passage referring to Juda is full of praise and blessing for that patriarch. Now, if the promised Messias were not to be of Juda's seed, the prophecy would be rather against than in favor of Juda, since it would announce that at some future time Juda would lose his sceptre and ruler's staff, which must pass over to the Messias, and in him to the tribe of his birth.

3. The contemporaries of Juda could infer from this prophecy that his special tribe would have the primacy among the Israelites until, at some future time, a prince

should be born who would own all power and dignity, and who would be honored by the voluntary obedience of many nations and peoples. By comparing this prediction with the previous Messianic prophecies, the devout Israelite could infer with the greatest probability that this prince of Juda's tribe would be the seed of the woman by whose agency the serpent's head would be crushed, and the seed of the patriarchs in whom all the nations of the earth were to be blessed. Hence they might expect by virtue of the prophecy a mighty prince springing from the family of Juda, who would bring most of the nations to his obedience, and who would, by means of this obedience, procure for them all manner of supernatural blessings.

4. Omitting the rationalistic views which have been stated in the explanation of the text, we must draw attention to the fact that from Jacob's prophecy may be drawn an invincible argument against the Jews. For even if we do not insist on the minute points of agreement between prophecy and fulfilment, which might perhaps be questioned by our opponents, it is at least certain that the sceptre and the ruler's staff have passed away from the favored tribe, and that therefore the "Shiloh," in whatever sense the word may be taken, must have come before our time. Nor can it be said that Jacob's prediction was wholly conditional, the condition of "Shiloh's" coming being the faithfulness of Israel. In the prophecy itself there is no vestige of such a condition; its assumption is, therefore, a gratuitous subterfuge. At most it might be granted that the political supremacy promised to Juda would be interrupted for a time on account of the sins of the people; but the whole order of God's supernatural providence, which he had several times unconditionally predicted, could certainly not be rendered void by human malice.

## Section II. Daniel's Seventy Weeks.

Dan. ix. 22-27.

## INTRODUCTION.

**1. TIME AND OCCASION OF THE PROPHECY.**—In the first year of Darius the Mede, in the sixtieth year of the Babylonian captivity, Daniel, considering that the seventy years of desolation foretold by Jeremias (xxv. 11; xxix. 10) were drawing to their close, implores God in fervent prayer to forgive the people's sin, and to look favorably upon his ruined sanctuary (vv. 1-19). The angel Gabriel appears to Daniel and lifts up his thoughts from the seventy years of the captivity to the seventy weeks that must elapse till the Messianic redemption will arrive. The entire period of seventy weeks is divided into three periods, consisting of seven, and sixty-two, and one week, respectively. It is foretold that in seven weeks after the issuing of the command to restore the city Jerusalem will be rebuilt, though in straitened times; that at the end of the sixty-two weeks elapsed after the seven weeks, an anointed one, a ruler, will appear; that finally an anointed one will be cut off, and the people of a prince that shall come will desolate the city and the sanctuary, and he will make a covenant with many in one week, and during half of this week (or about the middle of this week) sacrifice and oblation will cease until the end come, and the divinely decreed consummation.

**2. UNCHRISTIAN EXPLANATIONS OF THE PROPHECY.**—*a.* The command to restore Jerusalem is the divine promise given through Jeremias (xxxi. 38 ff.) for the rebuilding of the city (B.C. 588); the anointed prince is Cyrus (B.C. 538; cf. Is. xlv. 1; xlv. 28); the "straitened times" refers to the depressed state of the community (B.C. 538-172); the anointed one is the high-priest Onias III., deposed in 175 B.C., assassinated in 172 B.C. (cf. II. Mach. iv.); the people of the coming prince, etc., alludes to the attacks made on Je-

rusalem by Antiochus Epiphanes, to the willing allies whom he found among the renegade Jews, to his suspension of the temple services, and the destruction which finally overtook him (164 B.C.). In the beginning of the prophecy the Messianic age is described which will succeed the persecutions of Antiochus, while the anointing of the Most Holy alludes to the re-dedication of the altar of burnt-offerings (165 B.C.).

1. Driver is right in admitting that one of the chief objections to this interpretation is that the period from B.C. 538 to 172 is only 366 years—not 434, or 62 weeks. To say that we do not know how the author computed his years, or what chronology he followed, is equivalent to acknowledging that the difficulty is unanswerable. 2. The parallelism between Dan. ix. 26b-27 and vii. 25 is not so great as to necessitate the above explanation in spite of its insuperable difficulties. 3. Nor can such a necessity be inferred from the fact that Antiochus is the principal figure in the whole section of Daniel to which the present prophecy belongs. 4. It is true that Schürer (*The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, II. iii. p. 54) offers several instances in which the Jewish historian Josephus and the Jewish Hellenist Demetrius miscalculate chronological dates by nearly the same number of years that is wanting in the preceding explanation of Daniel's prophecy. But it must be well noted that both of these historians evidently committed a chronological blunder—an imputation which Catholics cannot admit against Daniel, whom Schürer and the other writers of his school consider merely an author who endeavors to explain the seventy years occurring in Jeremiah's prophecy of seventy weeks of years. 5. There is another difficulty that Driver does not state: Jeremiah in his prophecy, which speaks of the seventy years, has nothing at all about the rebuilding of the city, and the prophecy itself was issued in the fourth year of Joakim, i.e., 606 B.C. (Jer. xxv. 1; cf. xxv. 11), while the year of Cyrus' edict is 536 B.C.—a period of 70, not of 7, weeks after the



prophecy. 6. After all these considerations we need not add that the supposition of two Christs, or Anointed Ones, is hardly called for by the wording of the prophecy. 7. Though Calmet adheres to this interpretation of the literal meaning of the prophecy, and in spite of such authorities as Hitzig, van Lennep (*De 70 jaarweken van Daniel*, Utrecht, 1888), and Cornill (*Die siebzig Jahrwochen Daniels*, 1889), we must state that this view appears to us wholly unsatisfactory.

*b.* According to Wieseler (*Die 70 Woche und die 63 Jahrwoche des Propheten Daniels*; cf. Corluy, *Spicil.*, pp. 506 f.) the anointed prince and the anointed one signify the same person, i.e., the high-priest Onias. The coming prince is Antiochus, who conquered the holy city, profaned the temple, interrupted the sacrifices for three years and a half, i.e., for half a week, and who finally entered into an unholy alliance with many Jews for seven years, after which period he died in a hostile invasion (cf. I. Mach. i. 11, 22, 23, 45, 57; vi. 1-9; II. Mach. v. 11-27; vi. 4; ix. 4). The following are the principal arguments for Wieseler's interpretation: 1. The general agreement of times and events with the terms of the prediction; 2. the parallelism of Dan. ix. 24 ff. and vii. 24, 25; xii. 7, 11, 12; vii. 26; 3. the abomination of desolation in the temple, which is foretold, is in Dan. xi. 31 identified with the idol-worship introduced into the temple by Antiochus; 4. another argument is taken from the Messianic blessings which Daniel describes in the beginning of his prophecy: the remission of sin, the sealing of the vision, and the anointing of the saint of saints. For Jer. l. 18-20 speaks about the end of sin and everlasting justice as arriving at the end of the Babylonian captivity; the sealing of vision and prophecy will happen about the same time, since the prophecy of which there is question is none other than that of Jeremias, concerning which Daniel was inquiring (cf. Dan. ix. 2; Jer. xxv. 11; xxix. 10); the holy of holies was anointed at the same time by the consecration of Zorobabel's

temple; 5. the words "and there is none to him" are quite applicable to Onias, who had no successor in the office of highpriest; 6. finally, the "wing" or "the height of abomination" (Heb.) is equally applicable to the polluted altar.

But this explanation does not agree with the true chronology. *a.* It is true that Cyrus' decree, to which reference is made in Is. xlv. 13, and which is presupposed by Agg. i. 4, implicitly contains the permission to restore the city, since it allows the Jews explicitly to rebuild the temple. But this decree was issued in 538 or in 536 B.C., while the highpriest Onias was deposed in 175 B.C., and killed three years later. Hence there is only an interval of 363 years between the decree and its supposed fulfilment. *b.* Besides, the deposition and death of Onias are hardly of sufficient importance to form the term of Daniel's prophecy. *c.* Again, the prophecy does not suppose that the coming leader will be killed; for in that case, the anointed prince of whom there is question in verse 25, and who is killed in verse 26, is again introduced as acting in verse 27—a process that can hardly be verified in the case of a mere man. *d.* The parallelism between the present prophecy and other passages of Daniel in which the prophet treats of Antiochus is sufficiently explained by the real analogy of events, even if ix. 24 ff. is a Messianic prediction. *e.* If the abomination of desolation was in the temple at the time of Antiochus, it was there not less truly at the time of the Roman invasion under Titus. *f.* Moreover, it is not certain that the abomination of desolation necessarily refers to idolatry, since it may well be understood of the Jewish sins which were the cause of the temple's destruction. *g.* Vision and prophecy cannot refer to the prediction of Jeremias alone, because the whole collection of his predictions was not sealed and put out of use, as it were, by the fulfilment of this particular prophecy. *h.* Everlasting justice did certainly not come at the time of Onias, since even after

his time the people of Israel was afflicted by reason of its transgressions (II. Mach. vi. 12 f.). *i.* Neither the first nor the second temple was anointed; hence the anointing of the holy of holies cannot be explained in this manner. The anointing must be understood metaphorically of the outpouring of the gifts of the Holy Ghost or, at least, of a special theocratic mission (cf. Ps. xlv. (xlv.) 8; Is. lxi. 1; I. Pet. ii. 5, 9; I. Jo. ii. 20, 27; Acts iv. 27; x. 38; II. Cor. i. 21; I. Kings xvi. 13, 14). *k.* Besides, all these privileges, the sealing of prophecy, the end of sin, and the anointing of the holy of holies, were predicted as occurring not before but after the seventy weeks.

*c.* After considering the more commonly accepted theories of Daniel's prophecy at greater length, we state briefly some of the other explanations that have found any distinguished adherents. According to Ewald, the anointed prince is Cyrus, the anointed one that will be killed is Seleucus IV. Philopator, the brother of Antiochus Epiphanes, who was poisoned. Finally, the coming leader is Antiochus himself. Rosenmüller's interpretation does not differ much from Ewald's, except that the anointed one who must be killed is Alexander the Great. The arguments brought against the preceding opinions are valid against the last two also. This applies equally to the view expressed by Briggs (*Messianic Prophecy*, p. 423), according to which some of the Fathers and many recent interpreters regard the prophecy as referring to the development of the kingdom of God, from the end of the exile to the fulfilment of the kingdom at the second advent. The meaning of the word "weeks," compared with the historical events, renders this explanation wholly improbable.

**3. MESSIANIC CHARACTER OF THE PROPHECY.**—*a.* The LXX. translators seem to have understood Daniel's prophecy as predicting only a restoration of the holy city, followed by another Gentile conquest of the same, which in turn will be succeeded by a long prosperous theocratic rule and

end with a final irreparable destruction. Probably the first Gentile conquest was by them identified with the invasion of Antiochus, and the second they would have hardly distinguished from the Roman inroad under Titus. A similar view is represented in the few Rabbinic passages which refer to Daniel's prophecy at all. In Naz. 32 *b* it is noted that the prediction refers to the destruction of Jerusalem, or rather to the time when the second temple was to be destroyed. The same interpretation is found in Yalkut, vol. ii. p. 79 *d*, line 16th, etc., from the bottom.

*b.* From the New Testament, however, we may infer that the Jews at the time of Christ understood the prophecy as applying to the Messianic time. For Christ, in applying the prediction to the city's destruction by the Romans, speaks in such a manner that the apostles must have been quite familiar with this explanation of the prophecy. And since, immediately after, Jesus warns his disciples against false Christs, we have reason to infer that the apostles understood the prediction as referring to the true Christ.

*c.* Flavins Josephus (B. J. IV. vi. 3) testifies that the prophecy was understood of the ruin and destruction of Jerusalem. "And they fulfilled," he writes, "the prophecy given out against the fatherland. For there existed an old tradition among men, that at some future time the city should be destroyed and the sanctuary should be burnt by right of war, when a sedition should have arisen, and their own hands should have polluted the sanctuary of God; the unbelieving zealots made themselves the willing instruments of all this." The Jews must therefore have applied the prediction to the Roman inroad into Palestine.

*d.* It is certain that at the time of Christ the Jews generally expected the advent of the promised Messiah. This we see both from Sacred Scripture and from profane historians (cf. Jo. iv. 25; Luke ii. 25; xix. 11; xxv. 51; Tacitus, *Histor.* v. 13; Sueton., *Vespas.* 4). The older Rabbinic writers too, as Solomon Jarchi, etc., maintain that the time of the Messiah had been announced in Dan-

iel's prophecy, but in order to avoid the argument urged against them by the Christians, they said that the prediction had been conditional, its fulfilment depending on the state of the Jews at the time determined. Since, therefore, the Jews at that time were unworthy of the promised redemption, the Messiah did not appear.

*e.* If we turn to the Christian Church, we find that her founder was not alone in the Messianic interpretation of Daniel ix. 24 ff.; the oldest testimony after the Gospel account dates from the second century after Christ, and is contained in the Testament of the Patriarchs. In the Testament of Levi we have the following passage: "And now I know from the Book of Daniel that you will err for seventy weeks, and sin against the priesthood, and pollute the sacrifices, and destroy the law, and despise the words of the prophet; in your perversity you will persecute the just ones, and hate the pious, and abominate the sayings of the truthful, and call him a heretic who will restore the power of the law by the strength of the Most High. Finally, you will slay him, not being aware of his resurrection, and you will bring his innocent blood maliciously upon your own heads. On his account your sanctuary shall be deserted, shall be profaned down to its very foundations, and your place shall no longer be holy; you shall be cursed among the Gentiles, and despair shall afflict you, until he shall visit you again, and in his mercy receive you in faith and in water."

*f.* Many of the oldest Fathers omit the mention of Daniel's prophecy in their polemic and apologetic treatises; for in these writings they could employ only those predictions that were acknowledgedly Messianic. Reusch (*Theologische Quartalschrift*, 1868, pp. 535 ff.) has summarized the patristic literature referring to this prophecy in a masterly way, and from this work it appears that the Fathers were in no way unfamiliar with the Messianic interpretation of Daniel's prediction. *α.* Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* i. 21, 125 ff.) quotes the entire passage of

Theodotion: the saint of saints is Christ; the beginning of the seventy weeks coincides with the end of the Babylonian captivity; the last *week* coincides with the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans; of the public life and the death of Christ the Father says nothing.  $\beta$ . Origen has a double interpretation of the beginning of the seventy weeks: Jerome (In Dan. ix.) represents him as making the first year of Darius the Mede the beginning of the prophetic period, but it must be confessed that Origen himself (In Matt., n. 40) follows an entirely different method: the single weeks comprise 70 years, and they begin with the history of Adam, ending with the destruction of Jerusalem; the half of the week consists consequently of 35 years, so that the last half begins with the public life of Jesus and ends with Judea's ruin; the anointed leader is Jesus Christ, who spiritually restores Jerusalem and ends the times allowed to the Jewish nation.  $\gamma$ . Irenæus (Hær. V. xxv. 3, 4) makes the seventy weeks end with the end of the world; the half of the week is explained according to Dan. vii. 25, so that it refers to the persecution of Antichrist.  $\delta$ . Hippolytus (Int. Dan. ix. 2) begins the seventy weeks in the twenty-first year of the seventy years of Jeremias (Dan. ix. 2); the anointed leader he identifies with Jesus the son of Josedec; the sixty-two weeks he places between the end of the Babylonian captivity, i.e., the year 536 B.C., and the nativity of Jesus. The last week is supposed to precede the end of the world, its first half being assigned to the preaching of Enoch and Elias, its second half to the persecution of Antichrist.  $\epsilon$ . Julius Africanus (ap. Euseb. Demonstr. Evang. viii. 2, 46) begins the seventy weeks in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, which in his opinion is the fourth year of the 83d olympiad; he ends the prophetic weeks in the sixteenth year of Tiberius—according to Jerome (In Dan. ix.) in the fifteenth—i.e., the second year of the 202d olympiad.  $\zeta$ . Tertullian has again a different way of reckoning: beginning with the first year of Darius the Mede, whom he mistakes for Darius Nothus (424–404), he



counts  $437\frac{1}{2}$  years to the birth of Christ (i.e.,  $62\frac{1}{2}$  weeks); the remaining  $7\frac{1}{2}$  weeks intervene between Christ's birth and the destruction of Jerusalem (Adv. Jud. 8 and 11). It appears from the manner in which he begins his computation that he considers Christ's birth and passion as well as the destruction of Jerusalem as being predicted in Daniel's prophecy.  $\eta$ . Eusebius has given various explanations of Daniel's prophecy. In one place he agrees with the foregoing opinion of Julius Africanus (Demon. Evang. VIII. ii. 46); in another passage he begins the seventy weeks with the return of the exiles under Cyrus; seven weeks he counts till the restoration of the temple in the sixth year of Darius Hystaspis (516), and the following 62 weeks bring us to the death of the anointed leader Alexander Jannæus, and to the capture of Jerusalem by Pompey (Demon. Evang. VIII. ii. 55-79). A third opinion the writer proposes in Demon. Evang. (VIII. ii. 80): beginning with the second year of Darius Hystaspis (520 B.C.), the sixty-nine weeks end at the birth of our Lord; the cessation of the anointed signifies the end of the legitimate succession of highpriests; the last week is separated from the rest of the series, so that its first half embraces the public life of Christ, while its second half abrogates the worship of the Old Testament, and brings on the abomination of desolation by the passion and death of Jesus Christ.  $\theta$ . This last explanation of Eusebius is found also in the writings of Cyril of Jerusalem.  $\iota$ . Apollinaris of Laodicea (Jerome, in Dan. ix.) begins from the birth of our Lord and ends at the end of the world; the preaching of Enoch and Elias will fill one half of the last week, and the persecutions of Antichrist the other half.  $\kappa$ . Chrysostom (Adv. Jud. v. 9) begins his reckoning from the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, between which and the destruction of the Jewish state by Pompey and Vespasian he counts the 69 years, without mentioning the Messianic bearing of the prophecy.  $\lambda$ . Isidore of Pelusium is noted for the same silence (Ep. iii. 249).  $\mu$ . Basil (Or. 38) begins with the complete restoration of

Jerusalem in the twenty-eighth year of Xerxes; for according to the erroneous computation of Josephus, Nehemias came to Judea under Xerxes. From that period to the resurrection of Christ the Father counts 483 years; he explains the last week as employed in the founding of the Church after Christ's ascension, and identifies the abomination of desolation with the statue of Caligula erected in the temple at Jerusalem. *v.* Theodoret (In Dan. ix.) begins with the twentieth year of Artaxerxes; the sixty-nine weeks end at the beginning of Christ's public life, while the sixty-two weeks bring us to John Hyrcanus, under whom the legitimate succession of priests ceased. Theodoret represents the death of Christ and the abrogation of the Jewish worship as happening in the middle of the last week, and the destruction of Jerusalem he rightly regards as not forming part of the prophetic era. In his computation he employs lunar years. *§.* Ephrem (Oper. Syr. Ed. Rom. i. 221) is not concerned about the numbers, but maintains emphatically that the prophecy has a Messianic signification. Even the coming leader is Christ Jesus. *o.* Jerome and Augustine contend that Daniel's prophecy determines the time of the Messiah, of his coming and his suffering, but they decline to enter into any calculations (Aug. Epist. 189, al. 79).

#### DAN. IX. 22-27.

And he (Gabriel) instructed me, and spoke to me, and said: "O Daniel, I am now come forth to teach thee, and that thou mightst understand. From the beginning of thy prayers the word came forth, and I am come to show it to thee, because thou art a man of desires: therefore do thou mark the word, and understand the vision." Seventy weeks are shortened upon thy

<sup>1</sup> **Seventy weeks.** The Hebrew word rendered "week" properly signifies the number seven; but by common usage it has come to mean seven spaces of time of equal length, i.e., a week. *a.* It is evident from the contents that in the present passage there can be no question of the common week of days. *b.* Since in the beginning of the present chapter (ix. 2) there is question of the seventy years spoken of by Jeremiah, it is probable that in our prophecy seventy

people, and upon thy holy city, that transgression may<sup>2</sup> be finished, and sin may have an end, and iniquity may be abolished, and everlasting justice may be brought, and vision and prophecy may be fulfilled, and the<sup>3</sup> Saints of saints may be anointed.

weeks of years are intended. *c.* Such weeks of years were well known to the Jews, as we see from their law of the Sabbath and the jubilee-year, i.e., of the seventh year and of the seven times seventh year, respectively (cf. Lev. xxv. 2, 4, 5; xxvi. 34, 35, 43; 11. Par. xxxvi. 21). *d.* Even the other nations were acquainted with the year-weeks, as is seen from the words of M. Varro in the writings of A. Gellius: "He too had already entered the twelfth year-week." *e.* The opinion of some of the Rabbinic writers that jubilee-weeks are intended in Daniel's prophecy is not supported by a single analogy in other writings of either Hebrews or Gentiles, and has been introduced through theological prejudice. It is then evident that the prophet speaks of year-weeks in his prediction.

The numeral "seventy" follows the noun "weeks" in the Hebrew text, so as to render the word emphatic. The obvious sense of the passage supposes that the series of years is to be taken continuously, so that those rationalistic writers who place part of the seventy weeks in one century, part in another, offend against the first and fundamental principle of hermeneutics. Another reason for taking the seventy years in one continuous series is suggested by the Hebrew verb rendered in our version by "are shortened." For in its original form it is in the singular number, so that it supposes the "seventy weeks" to constitute one unit. A more accurate rendering of the Hebrew verb would be "are cut off," i.e., "are decreed."

<sup>2</sup> **May be finished.** The word in our version gives the meaning of the Hebrew text rather than its literal wording. For if we retain the Hebrew consonants without considering that the Piel-form of the verb which is indicated by the vowels does not commonly occur, we ought to render "may be closed;" on the other hand, if we retain the present vowels and change one of the consonants so as to obtain a verb that is regularly susceptible of those vowels, we must render the word "may be consummated." The Septuagint, Theodotion, Jerome, and others have adhered to this latter method. The verb in the next phrase, "may have an end," has occasioned a similar difficulty: if the Hebrew consonants are kept and the vowels changed so as to obtain a form that is grammatically correct, we must translate the word "may be sealed." If the process is reversed, i.e., if the vowels are kept and the consonants changed so as to do justice to the exigencies of grammar, we must render the text "may be abolished." The present English rendering, therefore, gives the meaning of the Hebrew text, whatever correction be adopted.

<sup>3</sup> **Saint of saints.** *a.* If Daniel had intended to express the Vulgate rendering, he would have written "qadesh qedashim," instead of the actual reading "qodesh qodashim." *b.* Nor can it be maintained that the prophet refers to the "holy of holies" of the temple; for in order to express this meaning the Hebrew phrase would have needed the definite article "qodesh haqqodashim" (cf. Ex. xxvi. 33; Ezech. xlii. 13, etc.). *c.* Hence the proper and literal meaning

Know thou therefore and take notice, that from <sup>4</sup> the going forth

of the Hebrew text is "a holy of holies," i.e., "something most holy." There is, however, nothing to prevent us from understanding the expression metonymically of a person; for such a figure is not uncommon in Hebrew (cf. I. Par. xxiii. 14). Even the New Testament offers similar figures of speech, as may be seen in Luke i. 35 (Greek text). In this acceptation the Hebrew expression has been rendered in the Vulgate, and in the versions following it.

<sup>4</sup> **From the going forth of the word.** These words indicate that the prophet is about to give the term from which the seventy weeks should be reckoned. Two difficulties present themselves in connection with this subject: *a.* According to the Hebrew accents we should read: "From the going forth of the word to build up Jerusalem again, unto Christ the prince, there shall be seven weeks; and sixty-two weeks and the street shall be built again. . . ." It appears then that the anointed prince is predicted as coming after seven weeks, because the great pause is found after the latter clause. But, on the other hand, this interpretation of the prophecy is not probable in itself, does not fit into the context, and has been proved to be false by the historical event. We must then maintain that the Hebrew accent *Athnach* has not its usual disjunctive value; similar occurrences of *Athnach* without disjunctive value are found in Dan. ix. 2; Prov. vi. 26; Ps. lxxxiii. (lxxxiv.) 3, so that our interpretation does not rest on a mere theological necessity. *b.* The second difficulty connected with the clause "from the going forth of the word" concerns the identity of the decree from which the seventy weeks are reckoned. This question has been answered in the most various ways.

*a.* Hengstenberg, Reinke, etc., maintain that the decree from which the prophet reckons is the same as that of which the archangel Gabriel said: "From the beginning of thy prayers the Word came forth;" in other words, it is the divine decree concerning the restoration of Jerusalem and the temple. *α.* But this answer to the question is not satisfactory on account of its very subtlety. *β.* The Hebrew text does not permit us to adhere to this opinion, because the decree from which the prophet reckons is called "a decree," while it should be called "the decree," if it were identical with that previously mentioned. We must therefore explain the text as referring to one of the four royal decrees which were issued concerning Jerusalem and the temple.

*b.* The first royal decree regarding Jerusalem was issued by Cyrus in the year 536 B.C. (cf. I. Esdr. i. 1, 2). It is true that Esdras speaks only about a decree concerning the temple: "He hath charged me to build him a house in Jerusalem;" but the restoration of the temple would imply the rebuilding of the city. This is expressly stated in Is. xlv. 13: "I have raised him [Cyrus] up to justice, and I will direct all his ways; he shall build my city. . . ." The prophet Aggeus (i. 4) supposes too that the city had been restored before the temple was rebuilt. "Is it time for you," the prophet says, "to dwell in ceiled houses, and this house lie desolate?" *α.* But, on the other hand, in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, al-

of the word to build up Jerusalem again<sup>6</sup> unto Christ the prince

most a full century after Cyrus, the temple was still in ruins. For Nehemias, the son of Helchias, testifies (II. Esdr. i. 3): "They that have remained, and are left of the Captivity there in the province, are in great affliction and reproach; and the wall of Jerusalem is broken down, and the gates thereof are burnt with fire." *β.* Besides, Cyrus' decree says nothing of the restoration of the city, while Daniel's decree is explicit in its mention of it. All that is implicitly contained in the explicit decree regarding the restoration of the temple may be reduced to the erection of a number of dwelling-houses, without in any way extending to the formal building of a city. *γ.* And if we adopt this view, we are enabled to explain the texts of Isaias and Aggeus as referring to those habitations which later on became the nucleus of the restored city.

*c.* The second royal decree was issued by Darius, the son of Hystaspis, in the year 519 B.C. It is recorded at length in I. Esdr. vi. 1-12, and is evidently nothing but a repetition of Cyrus' decree for the restoration of the temple. In fact, it states that Cyrus' commands had not yet been complied with, and hints at some of the obstacles that may have prevented its ready execution. No noted authority has maintained that Daniel's seventy weeks are to be computed from this decree, and all the arguments which militate against the identity of the prophet's decree with that of Cyrus are equally valid against its identity with that of Darius.

*d.* The royal decree from which Daniel reckoned his seventy weeks is by Pusey (Lectures on Daniel, pp. 169 f.) and Delattre (De l'Authenticité du livre de Daniel, pp. 62-64) identified with that which Artaxerxes issued in the seventh year of his reign. The decree belongs, therefore, to the year 458 B.C., and is duly recorded in I. Esdr. vii. 14 ff. *α.* Though we freely grant that the restoration of the city is implicitly contained in the royal grant, it is still noticeable that it is not explicitly mentioned. *β.* The judges that were to be established according to vv. 25, 26 might well exercise their judicial power in settling the quarrels among the settlers around the new sanctuary. A regularly constituted city is not necessarily presupposed. *γ.* If in I. Esdr. iv. 12 the walls are said to have been restored, it appears from II. Esdr. ii. 3 (cf. II. Esdr. vi. 6, 7) that the former statement is a mere calumny of the Jews' political enemies. *δ.* The decree issued in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes may be called a mere repetition of the decree issued in the seventh year; still it must also be kept in mind that before the second decree Nehemias asked leave to return to Jerusalem, which he promised to rebuild (II. Esdr. ii. 5).

*e.* The fourth royal decree that has been, and still is, variously identified with the prophetic decree of Daniel (cf. Hengstenberg, Reinke, etc.), was issued by Artaxerxes in the twentieth year of his reign, i.e., 445 B.C. *α.* This decree was a formal royal edict (II. Esdras ii. 8, 9), such as is supposed in the Hebrew text of Daniel; *β.* moreover, it was the first decree which expressly granted leave to restore the city with its walls, gates, and fortifications (II. Esdr. ii. 3, 5, 13, 17; iii. 1 f.). *γ.* From I. Esdr. ix. 9 it appears that at the same time permission was granted to put up fences, etc., for the protection



there shall be seven weeks, and sixty-two weeks, and the street

of the vineyards. Thus far everything proves that Daniel's decree must be identified with this second decree of Artaxerxes.

We shall see, however, that there are very specious chronological difficulties militating against such an identification. But leaving these for the present, we must show that there are many historical notices in Sacred Scripture which well agree with the view which identifies the decree of Daniel with either the first or the second of Artaxerxes. *α.* After the issuing of these decrees the Jews began to restore the holy city with its walls and fortifications (II. Esdr. iii.); all this they had to do under distressing circumstances, the Samaritans being a constant source of annoyance to them (II. Esdr. iv. 7-23; vi. 1-15). According to the wording of the prophecy we may well suppose that the restoration occupied a space of seven weeks, or forty-nine years. *β.* After the further lapse of sixty-two weeks appeared the Messiah at the Jordan, was baptized by John, and proclaimed by the voice of the heavenly Father as his beloved son, in whom he was well pleased (Matt. iii. 16, 17). For the opinion of some of the Fathers who look upon the Messiah's birth as the term of the prophecy cannot be reconciled with the chronological requirements of the prophet. The opinion which sees in the anointing of "something most holy" the foundation of the Church is at least less probable than our view, which identifies this unction with the public and official mission of the Messiah, taking place as it did at the Jordan, before the eyes of innumerable witnesses (cf. Luke i. 35; Acts iii. 14). *γ.* During the course of the last week the Messiah was slain, and while he expired on the cross the tearing of the veil announced the abrogation of the Old Testament sacrifices, and finally determined the destruction of the people, which had till then belonged to the Messiah. This formal rejection on the part of God implied an irreparable destruction of the nation, which attained its final completion when the Roman armies under Titus swept away the city and the temple from the face of the earth. *δ.* In order to console the people, however, even in the height of their affliction, Gabriel predicts that the Messiah will during the course of the last week confirm his covenant with many of the people, so that these at least will become the happy sharers of the Messianic redemption. And history, in its turn, tells us that many were converted to Christ by the power of his word, and that many more accepted his teaching through the ministry of the apostles.

<sup>6</sup> **Unto Christ the prince.** The Hebrew phrase "*Mashiach nagid*" has been variously interpreted: *a.* Some translate "unto the anointed prince." But in order to have this meaning the adjective "*mashiach*" should follow the noun "*nagid*." *b.* Others have looked upon "*Mashiach*" as a proper name, which has on that account no article accompanying it. Similar phrases in which other words are thus construed as proper names may be seen in Num. xxiv. 16; Ps. xlv. (xlv.) 1; lxxi. (lxxii.) 1; Zach. iii. 8; Jo. iv. 25. But if this were true, the noun "*nagid*" which follows "*Mashiach*" should have the definite article. *c.* Theodotion and his followers have therefore preferred to render the phrase as "unto an anointed one, a



shall be built again, and the <sup>6</sup> walls in troublesome times. And after sixty-two weeks <sup>7</sup> Christ shall be slain, and the <sup>8</sup> people that

prince." But it must be remembered that in the following sentence the same "Mashiach" is again introduced, and again without the definite article. Now if "Mashiach" were not a proper name, it ought to have the definite article—at least, where it occurs for the second time. *d.* It is, therefore, preferable to consider Daniel's way of speaking in the present passage as poetical; hence the article before the noun in apposition to the proper name has been omitted through a poetic license (cf. Corluy, *Spicil.*, i. p. 480; Pusey, *Lectures on Daniel*, pp. 173 f.; *Dan.* viii. 14).

<sup>6</sup> The walls. *a.* The Hebrew word "charuts" is, properly speaking, the passive participle of the verb "charats," to cut, to decree. Hence its literal meaning is "decree." *α.* It is rendered in this sense in *Is.* x. 23 and *Joel* iii. 4. *β.* The words derived from the same root, which occur in the context of the present prophecy, have been interpreted in a like manner. But this interpretation introduces into the present passage a hard and unexpected parenthesis. *b.* Hence other writers maintain that the word "charuts" in the present passage is equivalent to the Chaldee "charits," fosse, aqueduct, or wall and fortification. Theodotion, the Vulgate, the Syriac version, and the context favor this rendering.

<sup>7</sup> Christ. We maintain that the Christ (Mashiach) spoken of in this sentence is identical with "Christ the prince" who is mentioned in the preceding sentence. And we further maintain that none but Christ Jesus is the person indicated by both these expressions. Preceding from the historical accomplishment of the prophecy in Christ Jesus, which will be shown in another place, we give here the following proofs for our interpretation: *a.* The good promised in the first part of the prophecy is evidently the Messianic salvation. Now these benefits are to come at the end of the seventy weeks, while the anointed prince "Mashiach nagid" is to come at the beginning of the last week, and the Christ "the Mashiach" is to be slain in the middle of the last week. The promised benefits are then connected with the "Mashiach nagid" and the "Mashiach;" in other words, the person indicated by these expressions is the Messiah. *b.* Though the term "Mashiach nagid" may be conceived as predicated of a Jewish king, the simple "Mashiach" was probably at the time of the prophet the consecrated name of the expected Redeemer (cf. *Ps.* xlv. (xlv.) 8; *Is.* lxi. 1; *Luke* iv. 18; *Matt.* ii. 4; xvi. 16; xxii. 42; xxiv. 5, 23; xxvi. 63, 68; *Mark* xv. 32; *Luke* ii. 11; iii. 15; xxiii. 2; *Jo.* i. 20, 25; iii. 28; iv. 25, 29; vii. 26; ix. 22; x. 24; xii. 43, etc.). The absence of the article before the word "Mashiach" is so far from opposing our interpretation that it rather favors our view. *c.* There is evidently some kind of a connection between the "Mashiach" and the "most holy" to be anointed during the course of the same last week. This connection cannot be explained any more satisfactorily than by identifying "the most holy" with the "Mashiach," who is most worthy of that title (cf. *Luke* i. 35; *Jo.* xvii. 19; *Mark* i. 24; *Acts* iv. 27; iii. 14; *Apoc.* iii. 7). *d.* The "Mashiach nagid" and the "Mashiach" are opposed to the "coming leader," who is

shall deny him shall not be his. And a people with their leader

presumably of a foreign race and country, since he will destroy the city and the temple. Hence the "Mashiach nagid" must be of the Jewish nation, the leader of the chosen people of God, and therefore the Messiah. *c.* In this manner too the clause "he shall confirm the covenant with many" is satisfactorily explained, while in any other hypothesis it remains inexplicable.

\* And the people that shall deny him shall not be his. This passage has a quite different reading in the Hebrew text; for there we have only the two words: "en lo" (not for him). The various interpretations given of the clause may be classed under two headings: *a.* The phrase is not elliptical. 1. It means "nothing unto him," so that the whole sentence reads: "Christ shall be slain, and nothing is left him after his death." The Hebrew form of the negative found in this phrase does not admit of such a rendering. 2. We must translate "not for himself," so that the passage means: "Christ shall be slain, and not for himself." *a.* A similar conception of Christ's death is found in Is. liii. 10. *β.* Still, the Hebrew negative found in the present phrase is not a mere negative particle, but means "there is not." *γ.* On the other hand, this negative term may have been used instead of the common one "lo," in order to avoid cacophony (lo lo), though the latter occurs in Dan. xi. 17. *δ.* If it be said that no one in the Old Testament is represented as having died for his own benefit, it must be kept in mind that he is truly conceived and represented as having died for his own advantage who gains life eternal by his temporal death. The history of the seven brothers dying for the observance of their law fully shows that such a conception was not foreign to the Jewish mind. 3. Others have rendered the phrase: "not on his own account," so that the passage means: "Christ shall be slain, but not on his own account," i.e., "not on account of any fault of his." *α.* It must be granted that the Hebrew preposition employed in the phrase now under consideration may have such a meaning (cf. Gen. iv. 23; Mich. i. 12; Num. xvi. 34; Job xxxvii. 1), *β.* but the common meaning "there is not" of the negative found in the same phrase, *γ.* and the uncommon and round-about way of expressing the thought implied in such an interpretation render this opinion very improbable. 4. Others again understand the Hebrew phrase as meaning: "and no one is unto him." *α.* But though the meaning of the passage "Christ shall be slain, and there is no one unto him to aid or defend him," is sufficiently probable, *β.* still the Hebrew negative particle with which we have to deal has this meaning only when the person in question is named in the context (cf. Lam. i. 2).

*b.* The second class of interpreters who have expressed an opinion on the meaning of the Hebrew phrase have regarded it as an ellipse. For it can hardly be said that a word has fallen out of the primitive text, since all the oldest versions render the phrase as brief and concise as it is found in the Hebrew text (LXX., Theodot., Aquil., Syr.). *α.* Some have therefore supplied "people," reading: "Christ shall be slain, and there shall be no more a people unto him" (Vulg., Pusey, etc.). *β.* Others have preferred "judgment," so that they render:

that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary, and<sup>9</sup> the end thereof shall be waste, and after the end of the war, the appointed desolation. And he shall confirm the covenant with many, in one week, and in the half of the week the victim and the sacrifice shall fail, and<sup>10</sup> there shall be in the temple the abomination of desolation, and the<sup>11</sup> desolation shall continue even to the consummation and to the end."

"Christ shall be slain, and there be no judgment unto him," i.e., he shall die unjustly (Theodot., several Greek Fathers). *γ*. Others again supply "the city and the sanctuary," *δ*. or "a Messiah," *ε*. or "that which had belonged to him." It is evident that according to these suggestions we obtain the meanings: "Christ shall be slain, and the city and sanctuary shall not be his;" or "Christ shall be slain, and there shall be no Messiah (Redeemer) unto him;" or, finally, "Christ shall be slain, and what had been his shall be his no more." This last rendering appears to be more satisfactory than any of the preceding ones. For by the death of Christ the temporal ruin of the Jewish people, which had belonged to Christ, was definitely settled.

<sup>9</sup> **And the end thereof shall be waste.** A literal rendering of the Hebrew text will serve as commentary on the following clauses: "And in that warlike inundation shall consist the final ruin of city and temple, and the war shall last till the destruction is complete, and the decreed devastation shall come to pass."

<sup>10</sup> **And there shall be in the temple the abomination of desolation.** The Hebrew text rendered literally reads: "and upon the wing of abominations." But the word which literally means "wing," is also used to signify "extremity" (cf. Is. xi. 12; xxiv. 16; Ezech. vii. 2). The Greek word meaning "pinnacle" is closely related to this expression (cf. Matt. iv. 5; Luke iv. 9), as may be seen in Suidas and Hesychius. We are therefore fully justified in rendering: "and upon the pinnacle (the height) of abomination." But the question as to what is meant by these words is not so easily settled. *a*. The phrase denotes the Roman ensigns and banners, and especially their winged eagles to which the armies paid divine worship; the Romans are represented as approaching upon these wings. This explanation is supported by I. Mach. i. 54 (Vulg. 57); Matt. xxiv. 15; xxiv. 28; Mark xiii. 14; Luke xxi. 28. It must, however, be noted that Matt. xxiv. 15 can hardly be adduced in favor of this interpretation, since "the holy place" in the language of the Machabees and of the LXX. means the temple, and not the surroundings of Jerusalem, and since Christ and the Evangelists most probably adopted the phraseology of the former (cf. F. d'Envieu, iii. pp. 1015 ff.). *b*. The expression "wing of abominations" indicates the temple, and the abominations are the vices of the Hebrew people with which they polluted the sanctuary. Jer. vii. 30 speaks of the Jewish depravity in a similar manner. This interpretation is supported by Dan. xi. 31; II. Mach. iv. 13-17; Matt. xxiv. 15, 16; Flavius Josephus, Bell. Jud. IV. vi. 3. Both of these explanations are therefore really probable.

<sup>11</sup> **The desolation shall continue.** A paraphrase of the Hebrew text

## COROLLARIES.

**CHRONOLOGICAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN PROPHECY AND FULFILMENT.**—1. Of the many attempts that have been made to make the prophecy chronologically agree with its fulfilment we may mention the following four (cf. Corluy, *Spicil.* i. pp. 498 ff.):

*a.* According to Pusey (*Lectures on Daniel*, pp. 169 ff.) the term from which the seventy weeks must be reckoned is the first decree of Artaxerxes, issued in the year 457 B.C. The end of the 69 weeks (483 years) falls then in the year 26 A.D., i.e., at the beginning of the public life of Jesus; after three years more Jesus died on the cross, and thus abolished Old Testament sacrifice and worship; during the course of the same week he instituted his Church, and thus confirmed his new covenant with many. If it be remembered that our present era probably begins about three or four years later than it really should do, the above-mentioned 26th year, in which the public life of Jesus begins, will become the 29th or 30th year of his life—a result agreeing with Luke iii. 1.

Thus far we have merely proposed and explained the first theory; we must now examine the two suppositions which are assumed in it. 1. The decree of Artaxerxes is placed in the year 457 B.C. 2. Our Christian era is assumed to begin several years after the birth of Christ.

1. According to I. Esdr. vii. 8 ff., the first decree of Artaxerxes was issued in the seventh year of his reign; in order, then, to coincide with the year 457 B.C. Artaxerxes

will offer the best commentary on the last part of Daniel's prophecy: "The last week will lead many (following Christ's and the apostles' instructions) to the new Messianic covenant, and in the middle of that week (Christ's bloody sacrifice on the cross) will abolish the Jewish sacrifices and worship. And (a few years later) the (Roman) destroyers will approach on the pinions of their abominable eagles, and they will press their conquest to such an extent that the destruction, which had been decided by an irrevocable decree, will pour itself out upon the devastated place."

must have begun to reign in 464 or 465 B.C. Our inquiry must therefore be, whether history confirms or, at least, permits, this date for the beginning of Artaxerxes' reign.

*a.* Diodorus Siculus testifies (xi. 69) that Xerxes was killed in the fourth year of the 78th olympiad, i.e., 465 years before the common era. Now Artaxerxes began to reign seven months after the death of Xerxes. But we can show independently that Artaxerxes began his reign between the fifth and the ninth month after the death of Xerxes. For in his twentieth year the month Caslen (ninth month) preceded the month Nisan (first month) according to II. Esdr. i. 1; ii. 1; again Nisan (first month) precedes in the same reign Ab (fifth month) according to I. Esdr. vii. 7, 9. The succession of months in Artaxerxes' reign was therefore ninth, first, fifth, i.e., he must have begun his reign between the fifth and the ninth month, i.e., between Ab and Caslen 464 B.C.

*b.* The Ptolemean canon and Eusebius place the death of Xerxes between Dec. 466 and Dec. 465 (cf. Migne, t. xix. pp. 473-476 in Chron. 2). Hence we obtain nearly the same result as from the above testimony.

*c.* Manetho testifies that Xerxes reigned 21, Artaxerxes 41 years (cf. Jul. Afric. ap. Syncell. p. 75); Diodorus gives the reign of Artaxerxes as lasting 40 years; Thucydides has it that Artaxerxes died in 424 or 425 B.C., and all historians agree that Xerxes began to reign in 485, i.e., in the first year of the seventy-fourth olympiad, or 270 U.C. Hence all historical testimony points to the year 465 or 464 as the first year of Artaxerxes' reign.

2. The second supposition implied in the first theory of agreement between Daniel's prophecy and its fulfilment makes our current Christian era begin several years after the birth of Christ. This supposition too is not only permitted but rather confirmed by historical testimony.

*a.* According to a common patristic tradition Jesus died under the consulate of the Gemini, i.e., 782 U.C. or 29 A.D. Now according to St. John the public life of Jesus embraced the celebration of at least three or probably four



Easter festivities (Jo. ii. 13; vi. 4; xiii. 1; v. 1). Hence his public life must have begun in 789 or 788 u.c. (26 or 25 A.D.). Again, the Gospel of St. Luke testifies that Jesus was about thirty years old when he began his public life (Luke iii. 23). Our common Christian era therefore must begin its reckoning about four years after the birth of Christ. *b.* St. Luke iii. 1 tells us that the Baptist's ministry began in the fifteenth year of Tiberius Cæsar; since Jesus did not begin his public life long after the appearance of the Baptist, his ministry must have begun about the same year. The fact that the fifteenth year of Tiberius' reign is 782 u.c. proves nothing against our position, since the evangelist includes Tiberius' proconsular reign, which the Senate decreed for him in 764 u.c. (cf. Tacit. Ann. i. 3; Velleius Paterculus, Hist. Rom. ii. 121; Suetonius, Tiber. xx. 21). Hence the fifteenth year is 778 or 779 u.c., which date agrees with that arrived at by the preceding line of argument. *c.* A third argument proving that our common Christian era begins several years after the birth of Christ is derived from the year of Herod's death. This occurred in April, 750 u.c., so that Christ cannot have been born later than 749 u.c.; since now the common era begins with that of Dionysius Exiguus, i.e., with 754 or 753 u.c., it follows that it starts three or four years after Christ's birth (cf. Patrizi, De Evang. Dissert. 20, 47, 51 libri iii.).

*b.* Vitringa (Sacrar. Observ. vi. 1-5), Hengstenberg, Reinke, Bade, and other scholars are of opinion that in computing the terms of the prophecy of Daniel we must adhere to the computation of the present Christian era, i.e., that our current Christian era begins neither later nor earlier than the year of Christ's birth. The Lord's baptism, therefore, occurred in the year 782 u.c. The term from which the 69 weeks must be computed is not the first decree of Artaxerxes, issued in the seventh year of his reign, but his second decree, issued in his twentieth year. For the twentieth year of Artaxerxes' reign is none other than 455 B.C., or 299 u.c. Adding the 69 weeks or the 483



years to 299, we obtain the above 782 u.c., i.e., the year of Christ's baptism according to the common era.

It is evident that the two suppositions implied in this view are: 1. that Artaxerxes began his reign in 475 u.c.; 2. that the common reckoning of our current Christian era is fully correct. Both of these assumptions are confirmed by learned historical investigations.

1. Artaxerxes began his reign in 475, because: *a.* After the tenth year of Xerxes' reign history is entirely silent about him. Ctesias tells only one event of his life after the fifth year of his reign, and Herodotus' last notice of Xerxes concerns the year 476 B.C. *b.* The historian Justinus has it (iii. 1) that at the time of Xerxes' murder Artaxerxes was still quite a boy. It is true that according to Ctesias Artaxerxes was born three or four years after Xerxes had been made king, so that he would have been only about seven years old at the time of his father's death had Xerxes reigned only 11 years; but then Ctesias is so untrustworthy in his chronology that we may reasonably follow the more common computation regarding the time of the birth of Artaxerxes. Accordingly, we may assume that Artaxerxes was born three or four years before Xerxes became king; had Xerxes reigned 21 years, Artaxerxes would have been about 25 years old at the time of his father's death, and could not have been called "quite a boy." *c.* The peace of Cimon, which all authors agree to have been concluded with Artaxerxes, falls according to the testimony of many in the year 470 B.C., so that Artaxerxes must have been king at that early date. *d.* Another argument for Artaxerxes' early accession to the throne may be taken from the fact that Themistocles is said to have taken refuge with him (cf. Thucydides (i. 137), Plutarch (27), Cornelius Nepos, Suidas, and the Scholiast of Aristophanes). For though Ephorus, Dinon, Clitarchus, and Heraclides maintain that Themistocles fled to Xerxes, the above-mentioned authors are in this matter of much greater authority. Now the flight of Themistocles to the Persian

court is placed before the year 470 B.C. by such authors as Cicero (Lael. 12), Diodorus Siculus (xi. 35), Eusebius (Chronicon Armen.), Thucydides (i. 136). The same may be inferred from the history of Ælian, according to which Themistocles resisted the tyrant Pisistratus when he was still a boy. Now the last year of Pisistratus was 529 B.C., and Themistocles died when he was 65 years of age. If we then suppose that Themistocles was about 8 years old at the time he resisted Pisistratus, he must have died about 472 B.C. Consequently, Artaxerxes must have begun to reign before 470, and in all probability about 475 B.C.

2. The second supposition implied in the present theory places the beginning of our present Christian era in the year of Christ's birth. This is proved from the Gospel of St. Luke (iii. 1, 23), taken together with the fact that on all medals and coins the years of Tiberius begin with the year in which he became emperor (167 U.C.). Father Riess (*Das Geburtsjahr Christi*, Herder, 1880, *Ergänzungsheft*) has fully developed the various other arguments for this view, so that it must be regarded as solidly probable.

The second explanation of the agreement between prophecy and fulfilment, as far as the seventy weeks of Daniel are concerned, rests therefore on historically tenable suppositions.

c. A third theory computes the seventy weeks from the second decree of Artaxerxes, issued in the year 457 B.C., or 297 U.C. The term to which the 69 weeks reach is the baptism of Jesus in the year 178 U.C., or 25 A.D. More accurately, however, only 68 weeks and 5 years lie between 457 and 178; the remaining two years of the 69 weeks elapse during the public life of Jesus, so that the middle of the seventieth week falls two or three years after the death of Jesus. As to the victim and the sacrifice, they are abolished during the course of the first half of the week, and not at the end of the first half.

This view of the prophecy implies: 1. that Artaxerxes began his reign in the year 476 B.C., so that his twentieth

year would be 457 B.C., or 297 U.C. 2. It supposes that the common Christian era begins several years after the real birth of Christ. The first supposition has in its favor all the arguments which show that Xerxes reigned only ten or eleven years; the second supposition is supported by all the arguments which are advanced in order to prove that Christ was born three or four years before the beginning of our present Christian era.

d. Wallon has formulated a fourth theory concerning the chronological agreement between the prophecy of Daniel and its fulfilment. According to this view, the term from which the seventy weeks must be computed is the same as in the second of the foregoing theories, i.e., the year 455 B.C., or the twentieth year of Artaxerxes' reign. The term to which the 69 weeks reach is the year 782 U.C., or the fifteenth year of Tiberius Cæsar. But though Christ's baptism occurred in 782 U.C., he was born in 747 U.C., so that at the time of his baptism he was 34 years and 2 months, or about 30 years old.

It is clear that this explanation involves three suppositions: 1. Xerxes reigned only about ten or eleven years. This has been shown to be probable under the second explanation. 2. Christ was born several years before the beginning of our common Christian era. This is sufficiently established under the preceding explanations. 3. The fifteenth year of Tiberius Cæsar, the year of Jesus' baptism, falls in 782 U.C. This third supposition rests on the fact that all the Latin and the Syrian coins reckon the years of Tiberius from his accession to the imperial throne, i.e., from 767 U.C. It is confirmed by the fact that in 786, the year of Christ's death, the parascève of the Pasch, or Nisan 14, falls on a Friday; again, Clement of Alexandria (Migne viii. 885), Julius Africanus, Cyprian, Philastrius, Gaudentius, and Prosper hold that Jesus taught only one year and died in the year 15 of Tiberius. Tertullian is of opinion that Jesus was baptized in the 12th, and died in the 15th, year of Tiberius Cæsar, while Irenæus, who is

almost an Apostolic Father, has it that Jesus died about the age of fifty.

But these latter patristic opinions only show that there is no perfect agreement among the Fathers concerning the years of the public life and death of our Redeemer, while they cannot lessen the value of other arguments which we may be able to find concerning them. Now, St. Luke's statement that Jesus was about thirty years old when he began his public life can hardly be reconciled with the view that he was  $34\frac{1}{2}$  years old at the time of his baptism. Again, the traditional chronology of St. Peter's pontificate and of the destruction of Jerusalem supposes that Jesus must have died in the year 782 u.c.

2. The second inference derivable from Daniel's prophecy is that by the Messiah remission of sin and perfect justice will be obtained. The Messianic time is a period in which "transgression may be finished, and sin may have an end, and iniquity may be abolished, and everlasting justice may be brought."

3. In the person and mission of the Messiah all the prophecies of the Old Testament will find their fulfilment. The Messiah himself will die a violent death. For vision and prophecy shall be fulfilled, and at the appointed time the Christ shall be slain.

4. The ruin of the city and the temple shall follow the Messiah's violent death as a natural consequence. "And a people with their leader that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary, and the end thereof shall be waste and after the end of the war the appointed desolation. . . . And the desolation shall continue even to the consummation and to the end."

5. The Messiah will abolish the Old Testament worship and sacrifices. "And in the half of the week the victim and the sacrifice shall fail, and there shall be in the temple the abomination of desolation."

6. The Messiah will institute a new covenant, which will

take the place of the former divine covenant. "And he shall confirm the covenant with many, in one week."

7. Jerusalem, the holy city of God, shall be restored in so far as it is a type of the restoration of God's kingdom upon earth. "The street shall be built again, and the walls in troublesome times."

8. If it be, finally, asked what special consolation the Jews could derive from Daniel's prediction, they found in it the assurance of a future restoration of their temporal and spiritual prosperity. All this was, however, foretold in such a manner that they could foresee the final ruin of their temporal well-being in the interest of the kingdom of God, into which many were to enter during the course of the last or the seventieth week.

### Section III. The Coming to the Temple.

Agg. ii. 1-10.

#### INTRODUCTION.

**1. THE HISTORICAL CONNECTION OF THE PROPHECY WITH ITS CONTEXT.**—The circumstances under which the present prophecy is written are entirely the same as those under which Zacharias wrote his celebrated oracles concerning the future deliverer. Sixteen years had elapsed since the return of the Jewish exiles from Babylon, and no successful effort had been made to rebuild the sanctuary. In the second year of Darius (B.C. 520) the prophets Aggeus and Zacharias (I. Esdr. iv. 24; v. 1, 2) reproached the people for their neglect, and exhorted them to apply themselves in earnest to the task, with the result that four years afterwards the work was completed.

**2. DIVISION OF THE PROPHECY.**—The prophecy of Aggeus consists of four sections, arranged chronologically: *a.* In the second year of Darius, the first day of the sixth month, Aggeus gave out the foregoing public appeal no longer to postpone the restoration of the temple. On the twenty-

fourth day of the same month the people, headed by Zorobabel and the high-priest Jesus, began the work. This is told in Agg. i. 1-ii. 1. *b.* On the twenty-first day of the seventh month the prophet encourages those who might have seen the temple of Solomon, and might regard the structure now rising from the ground as far inferior to it (Agg. ii. 2-10). *c.* On the twenty-fourth day of the ninth month the prophet teaches the people that so long as the temple continues unbuilt they are as men who are unclean, their offerings are unacceptable, and hence their unfruitful seasons (Agg. ii. 11-20). *d.* On the same day Aggeus encourages Zorobabel as the civil head of the restored community with the assurance that in the approaching overthrow of the Gentile thrones and kingdoms he will receive special signs of divine favor (Agg. ii. 21-24).

**3. EXPLANATIONS OF THE PROPHECY.**—*a.* The prophecy is concerned with the political commotions of the Persian and Greek empires, and with the honor which the temple shall receive through the gifts of the Gentiles (cf. II. Mach. iii. 2, 3; Ps. lxxi. (lxxii.) 10). The reasons for this interpretation are taken from the text and the context of the prophecy. *α.* The text of verse 7 supplies the desired argument: "Yet one little while (and I will move the heaven and the earth, and the sea and the dry land)" is the time which God assigns for the fulfilment of his prediction. But if the latter were Messianic, it would have been fulfilled 500 years, and more, after the prediction, which is surely not a mere "little while." *β.* Again, in the context of the prophecy (vv. 22, 23) God almost repeats the promise of vv. 7, 8, 9: "I will move both heaven and earth . . ." Now, vv. 22, 23 refer to the immediate future, and not to the far-off Messianic times. Therefore, the prediction of vv. 7, 8, 9 too must refer to the immediate future. The theological value of this opinion will be seen in what follows.

*b.* A second interpretation does not deny that the prophecy has reference to the Messiah and his times; but it is



Messianic only in so far as all future times will render the temple glorious by the gifts and the worship that the Gentiles will offer when humbled by the extraordinary reverses of war (Reinke, Hengstenberg). *α.* The first reason assigned for this explanation is the fact that the movements of the heaven and the earth and of the nations are not limited to any particular time in the prophecy. Hence they apply to all times. Still, on the other hand, it does not appear probable that such a general promise would have been set forth with such solemnity. *β.* The second reason advanced by the above authors rests on the fact that the temple is a type of the worship paid to the true God of Israel; this may be gathered from Is. ii. 2 f., and lx. 1 f. The temple is, therefore, represented as glorified by the conversion of the new nations to the worship of Jehovah. *γ.* But, on the other hand, it was not only the second temple that was such a type: the first temple had the same spiritual meaning. The mere conversion of the Gentiles would therefore not render "the glory of this last house more than of the first." *δ.* Nor can it be said that after the time of Aggeus many more Gentiles adhered to Jehovah than before his time, and that therefore the second temple would be more glorious than the first. For such a glory applied, at most, to the temple taken in its spiritual meaning, not to the material temple, while the prophecy of Aggeus speaks of the material rather than the spiritual temple.

*c.* Ribera is of opinion that the promise, "Great shall be the glory of this last house more than of the first," was verified not only by the corporal presence of the Messiah in the second temple, but also by the material splendor of Herod's temple. *α.* This opinion rests first on verse 9, where God says: "The silver is mine and the gold is mine." Now God really brought the silver and the gold into the second temple by means of Herod's restoration. When one reads Josephus' (*Antiq.* XV. xi. 2-5) description of the second temple, one can hardly fail to recognize in it the

verification of Aggeus' prophecy.  $\beta$ . Still, on the other hand, it is more commonly admitted that the glory of Solomon's temple exceeded that of Herod's, so that the prediction was not fully verified through the magnificence of the latter.

**4. THE MESSIANIC NATURE OF AGGEUS' PROPHECY.**—*a*. St. Paul, in his epistle to the Hebrews (xii. 25, 26, 27), clearly applies part of this prophecy to the Messianic times. Exhorting his readers to "refuse him not that speaketh," he reasons in this manner: "They escaped not who refused him that spoke upon the earth," i.e., on Mount Sinai, when he shook the whole desert. Much less shall we escape if we refuse him who says: "Yet once more, and I will move not only the earth, but heaven also," which he did in the establishing of the Christian dispensation. "For in that he saith: Yet once more, he signifieth the translation of the movable things as made," i.e., he shows that the covenant made during the first shaking of the earth will be abrogated; "that those things may remain which are immovable, i.e., that the new covenant, made when the earth and heaven were moved, may be everlasting. If it be objected that the moving of heaven and earth promised in the prophecy was to take place after "one little while," it must be remembered that 500 years are a very little while for the eternal God. *b*. The moving of heaven and earth, and especially of "all nations," is in Sacred Scripture the common figure of the Messiah's coming; this may be seen in I. Kings ii. 10; Joel ii. 28–31 (this latter passage is explained in Acts ii. 17–20); Ps. xev. (xevi.) 9–11. *c*. The glory which the prophet promises to the new temple appears to be identical with that spoken of in Is. lx. 1, 2; now the latter is evidently the glory Jerusalem will receive from the Messiah. *d*. The promise of peace too, "and in this place I will give thee peace, saith the Lord of hosts," gives the prophecy a Messianic bearing, as may be inferred by a comparison with Mich. v. 5; Is. ix. 6, 7; liii. 5; Ps. lxxi. (lxxii.) 3, 7; Luke i. 79; ii. 14; Col. i. 20, etc. *e*. The

words, "I will move all nations," appear to have reference to the divine judgment of the Gentiles which in I. Kings ii. 10 and Dan. vii. 14 is connected with the advent of the Messiah. *f.* If in Agg. ii. 22-24 the promise, "In that day I will take thee, O Zorobabel, my servant, and will make thee as a signet, for I have chosen thee," refers to Zorobabel and connects his elevation with the overthrow of the nations, that Jewish king is in reality only the type of his great offspring, the flower of the root of Jesse.

It is true that the Jews now generally understand this prophecy as applying either to the greater glory of the Herodian temple, or to the longer duration of the second temple,—according to some authorities the first stood 410, the second 420 years,—or again of the future temple that will be built at the time of the Messiah. But to this interpretation they have been driven by their theological exigencies. The Jews who rejected our Lord were still convinced that the prophecy must be verified during the time of the second temple. Josephus (B. J. VI. v. 4) and Tacitus (Hist. v. 13) endeavor to wrest the prediction to Vespasian; R. Akiba, who was accounted the first oracle of his time, the first and greatest guardian of the tradition and the old law, of whom they said that God revealed to him things unknown to Moses, was induced by Aggeus' prophecy to acknowledge the impostor Bar-cochba, to his own and his nation's destruction. Following the traditional meaning of the great prophecy, the great rabbi paraphrased the words, "Yet a little, a little of the kingdom, will I give to Israel upon the destruction of the first house, and after the kingdom, lo! I will shake heaven, and after that will come the Messiah" (Pusey, "Minor Prophets," ii. pp. 311 f.). Then, again, the Midrash on Deuteronomy (ii. 31; sect. 1) has the following words: "Behold, I have begun. This refers, said Rabbi Azarya, to the help which is once to come. How so? As the prophet said to Israel: Yet once, it is a little while, and I will shake the heavens . . ."

Calmet, Bade, and Catholic theologians generally are,

therefore, right in believing that Aggeus' prediction has been fully verified in the time of Jesus Christ.

### AGG. II. 1-10.

In the four and twentieth day of the month, in the sixth month, in the second year of Darius the king they began. And in the seventh month, the one and twentieth day of the month, the word of the Lord came by the hand of Aggeus the prophet, saying : " Speak to Zorobabel, the son of Salathiel, the governor of Juda, and to Jesus, the son of Josedee, the high-priest, and to the rest of the people, saying : ' Who is left among you that saw this house in its first glory ? and how do you see it now ? is it not in comparison to that as nothing in your eyes ? Yet now take courage, O Zorobabel,' saith the Lord, ' and take courage, O Jesus, the son of Josedee, the high-priest, and take courage, all ye people of the land,' saith the Lord of hosts, ' and perform (for I am with you,' saith the Lord of hosts) ' the word that I covenanted with you, when you came out of the land of Egypt, and my spirit shall be in the midst of you ; fear not.' For thus saith the Lord of hosts : <sup>1</sup> ' Yet one little while, and I will move the heaven, and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land, and I will move all nations, and the <sup>2</sup> desired of all nations shall come, and I will fill this

<sup>1</sup> **One little while.** In order to render the full meaning of the Hebrew text we must translate: " Yet once, it is a little while." The " once " looks forward and conveys that God will again shake the world, but once only; the " yet " looks back to the first great shaking of the moral world, when God's revelation to Moses and his chosen people broke upon the pagan world. The " little while " refers to the 517 years that were to elapse between the prophecy and the birth of Jesus Christ. It really is a little while as compared with God's eternity, which the prophet has in view, as compared with the several thousand years that had already elapsed after the first promise of the Messiah, and finally as compared with the duration of the Christian dispensation which was to begin at the end of the 517 years. Hence it follows: 1. That the prophet does not wholly insist on the shortness of time before the Messiah should arrive ; 2. that in reality two things are predicted by the phrase: *a*, the shortness of time to the coming of the Messiah; *b*, the stability of the new covenant, which is to be concluded after that short period ; 3. the LXX. version and the Syriac, rendering the phrase " once more," give only one half of the real meaning. St Paul (Heb. xii. 26, 27) implies both meanings; the Chaldee paraphrase, too, clearly indicates both significations.

<sup>2</sup> **The desired of all nations shall come.** There are two principal difficulties connected with these words : 1. the verb " shall come " is

house with glory,' saith the Lord of hosts. 'The silver is mine,

in the plural number in the Hebrew text; 2. the "desire of all nations" may be taken either subjectively or objectively.

1. Of the first point various explanations have been given: *a.* The subject of the clause is indefinite, so that we must render: "they shall come with the desire of the nations," i.e., "with the most precious things." But such a rare and uncommon ellipsis cannot be admitted as long as we are able to find another interpretation. *b.* Bade, with a few others, explains the plural number as a plural of majesty, because, according to him, the subject is the Messiah. But it must be kept in mind that where the plural of majesty occurs in the verb it is also found in the subject (cf. Gen. xx. 13; xxxv. 7; II. Kings vii. 23, etc.); Is. xlv. 8 is no exception to this rule, since in that passage the plural verb refers to a subject taken in a collective sense. *c.* Others again have explained the plural verb as referring back to the plural genitive in the phrase "the desire of all nations." Though such a construction is found in Hebrew, still it supposes that the thought expressed by the possessive is the principal idea of the whole phrase. Now, this is not the case in the present passage. *d.* It is therefore preferable to regard the subject "the desire of all nations" as an abstract term, implying all the various benefits that are contained in the Messianic blessings. For we shall see in the next paragraph that the clause has a Messianic meaning.

2. The second hermeneutic difficulty connected with our passage regards the precise meaning of its subject, "the desire of all nations." *a.* The clause has a subjective meaning, i.e., it refers to that people among all the nations which is most desired. It must therefore be rendered "the most desirable of all nations" (Hitzig, Umbreit, Ewald formerly, Scholz, Hengst.). Similar constructions occur in Os. xiii. 15 (vessels of desire), Ps. cv. (cvi.) 24 (land of desire); Ezech. xxvi. 12 (houses of thy desire); Jer. xii. 10 (my portion of desire), etc. But it should be noted that in all these instances the word meaning "desire" follows the other noun of the phrase. In the present passage, on the contrary, the word "desire" precedes its companion noun. *b.* There are two passages in the Old Testament besides the one we are now discussing in which the Hebrew noun meaning "desire" precedes its noun. In I. Kings ix. 20 we read "the whole longing of Israel;" in Dan. xi. 37 the prophet speaks about "the desire of women." Now in both these cases the clause is interpreted objectively, i.e., the word "desire" stands for that which is desired. But there now rises the further question: What did the prophet mean by "that which all the nations desire"?

*a.* All the Messianic blessings taken collectively are indicated by the phrase, because all nations desired these blessings (cf. Rom. viii. 19-22; Is. ii. 2 f.; xi. 10; lx. 9; Gen. xlix. 10); the same blessings were given in the temple, because it was there that Jesus preached the principal truths of the Christian dispensation (cf. Jo. ii. 19; vii. 14 f.; viii. 2 f.; x. 23 f.); the temple therefore is truly represented as partaking of the glory of the Messianic blessing, and the context (the predicate of the phrase is a plural verb) appears to require such a collective meaning of "the desire of all nations."

and the gold is mine,' saith the Lord of hosts. 'Great shall be the glory of this last house more than of the first,' saith the Lord of hosts; 'and in this place I will give peace,' saith the Lord of hosts."

### COROLLARY.

1. History shows us that God moved all the nations before the coming of Jesus Christ. The Persian kingdom fell before Alexander; Alexander's world-empire was divided among his four successors, two of whom continued and two fell before the Romans; then followed the Roman civil wars, until under Augustus the temple of Janus could be shut, and universal peace reigned upon the earth.

The heavens too were moved about the period of redemption by the star which led the wise men to Bethlehem, by the angels who announced the newly-born Saviour to

b. Most Catholic interpreters and several Protestant writers (Pusey, e.g.) understand by the "desire of all nations" the person of the Messiah.  $\alpha$ . The plural verb does not appear to contradict this meaning, because a person may well be represented as the object of our desires; thus we read in Cicero (*Fam.* xiv. 2) a husband's farewell to his wife: "Farewell, my longings, farewell."  $\beta$ . Besides, the person of Christ was more closely connected with the temple than the preaching of his doctrine was, and the words "I will fill this house with glory" seem to require rather a personal presence than a mere doctrinal influence.  $\gamma$ . The parallel prophecy (*Mal.* iii. 1) too refers to the person of the Messiah, so that we must seek a similar reference in the present prophecy.  $\delta$ . Nor can it be said that the Messiah did not enter the second temple, but rather that of Zorobabel. First, this exception would be equally valid against the previous interpretation. Then, a passage of Josephus (*Antiq.* XV. xi. 1) shows that Herod did not destroy Zorobabel's temple in order to erect a new edifice, but that he rebuilt part after part, leaving the new edifice morally identical with the preceding one. Thirdly, the Jews well understood this, since they never speak of a third temple, but only of a first and a second one. Besides all this, it will be remembered that in verse 4 the prophet says. "Who is left among you that saw this house in its first glory?" There is question of "this house" and its "first glory." The "glory" evidently refers to that of Solomon's temple; the word "this house" must therefore be taken not literally of the second temple then building, but rather of the temple as the representative of all Jewish temples, past or future. The prophet continues, contrasting not temple with temple, but the "first glory" with the glory to come (cf. Corluy, *Spicil.* i. 522; Pusey, "*Minor Proph.*," in h. l.).



the shepherds, by the preternatural darkness that clouded the skies during the hours of Christ's passion, by Jesus' ascension into the highest heavens, by the descent of the Holy Ghost with a sound from heaven as if of a mighty wind coming, and above all by the commotion in the very bosom of the Most Holy Trinity, if we may speak in this manner without irreverence—a commotion which resulted from the Second Person's putting on the weak mortal flesh of man in the womb of the ever Blessed Virgin Mary.

God had moved the sea when the Israelites passed through the Red Sea, and later on through the Jordan, when there was dry ground in the sea, a wall in the waves, a path in the waters; and God moved the waters again when the Lord of heaven not only sailed over the surface of the sea, but walked thereon without peril, commanded the angry fury of the storm, and bade the deep be still.

In the Old Testament God moved the dry land when the wilderness supplied a daily harvest of heavenly food, when the rock gushed forth fountains of water. But the dry land was moved again when the rocks were split, when the graves were opened at the death of Christ, when the unfruitful people of the Gentiles ripened to a harvest of faith and devotion.

2. The desired of all nations came and filled the temple with glory when he was presented in the temple by his parents, and was proclaimed by Simeon to be God's own salvation, "prepared before the face of all the peoples as a light to the revelation of the Gentiles, and as the glory of the people Israel" (Luke ii. 30-32). Again did the desired of all nations fill the temple with glory when he purged it from all defilement, driving out all the buyers and sellers, and restoring to the place its proper sanctity. Well then might the prophet say: "The gold is mine, and the silver is mine," showing that these outward riches appear despicable when compared with the presence of Jesus Christ.

3. Peace too did God give in Jerusalem through his Christ when the angels proclaimed peace to men at the

Redeemer's birth, when Jesus left that peace to his apostles before his suffering, which, dying on the cross, he merited for all men, and which the apostles have preached to all nations (Luke ii. 14; Jo. xiv. 27; xx. 19, 21; Rom. v. 1; Acts x. 36; Eph. ii. 14-18).

## CHAPTER III.

## THE VIRGIN MOTHER. Is. vii. 1-17.

## INTRODUCTION.

**1. HISTORY AND OCCASION OF THE PROPHECY.**—We learn from IV. Kings xvi. 1-4 that Achaz despised the traditions of his fathers, and openly professed idolatry. Hence he was given over by God into the hands of the Syrian king, who carried off immense booty to his royal capital, Damascus. But the king of Israel too afflicted the kingdom of Juda with exceeding bitter afflictions (II. Par. xxviii. 5)—so much so that he slew of Juda a hundred and twenty thousand on a single day. But this war, which was a real chastisement of Achaz on the part of God, had also its special natural causes.

It appears that an alliance had been concluded between Phacee, king of Israel, and Rasin, king of Damascus, for the purpose of opposing a barrier to the Assyrian aggressions. Cherishing Assyrian proclivities as Achaz did, he did not join the coalition; the allies therefore invaded his territories, intending to dethrone Achaz and substitute for him a more subservient ruler, a certain son of Tabeel. The invasion caused great alarm in Jerusalem, though Phacee alone appears at first to have gone against the capital, while Rasin was occupied in reconquering the maritime city, Elath. After this victory he must have joined his ally in his assault on Jerusalem. Achaz meditated casting himself on Assyria for help—a policy of which the prophet Isaias strongly disapproved. He was divinely instructed to assure Achaz that his fears were groundless, and that

the two kingdoms were doomed to destruction. To overcome the king's distrust, the prophet offers to give him a sign; but through the king's diffidence the sign becomes an omen of ruin for Juda: the land will indeed be saved from the two kings according to God's promise, but the land of Juda will become the battle-ground in the conflict between the Egyptian and the Assyrian armies.

Achaz, however, sent his messengers to the Assyrian king Theglathphalasar, asking for his help in present distress (II. Par. xxviii. 16; IV. Kings xvi. 7). The Assyrian monarch complied with Achaz' request and invaded Damascus; the allied kings had therefore to abandon their warlike designs on Juda and provide for their own safety (IV. Kings xvi. 5, 6). Theglathphalasar transported the inhabitants of Damascus to Cyrene, and killed its king, Rasin (IV. Kings xvi. 9). Then he invaded also the kingdom of Israel, and transported a number of its inhabitants into Assyria (IV. Kings xv. 29). Phacee, the Israelite king, was slain by conspirators in the seventeenth year of his reign, and in the third year of Achaz' rule, i.e., in the same year in which the two allied kings had invaded the kingdom of Juda (IV. Kings xv. 30). But after subduing the Syrian and the Samaritan kings, the Assyrian conqueror invaded also the kingdom of Juda and devastated it without resistance, so that only few inhabitants with their herds and cattle remained (II. Par. xxviii. 20; cf. Is. viii. 7, 8).

**2. ERRONEOUS EXPLANATIONS OF THE PROPHECY.** — *a.* Several of the ancient Jewish writers maintain that the Emmanuel promised to be born of the virgin is Achaz' son and successor, Ezechias. But it must be remembered that Ezechias was about eight or nine years old at the time of the prophecy, for he was twenty-five years old when he began to reign, i.e., about 15 or 16 years after the prophecy was given (IV. Kings xviii. 2).

*b.* Several rationalistic authors and the Catholic writer Isenbiehl regard Emmanuel as the son of a virgin who will lose her virginity in the conception and birth of the boy.

The name Emmanuel is nothing but a symbol, just as the names Schear - Iashub and Maher - Shalal - Chash - Baz are symbolic. The sign consists in Isaias' predicting that the virgin will conceive in her first intercourse, and that she will bring forth a boy. The foreknowledge of both of these circumstances requires a special divine assistance, and is therefore rightly represented as a sign. This opinion will be refuted in the course of our treatment of the prophecy.

c. Delitzsch has a rather curious explanation of the prophecy. According to him God had revealed two future facts to Isaias—the virginal conception of the Messiah and the immediate liberation of Juda from its oppressors. The *time* of the Messiah's coming had, however, not been made known to the prophet. Isaias, therefore, trying to combine the two prophecies, was of the opinion that the birth of the Messiah would precede the liberation of the theocratic kingdom. The result is that the prophecy represents the Messiah as being about to be born, and describes the land of Juda as about to be freed before the Messiah will have attained the use of reason, i.e., before he will have reached the years of discretion. It may be of interest to know that Rosenmüller too gives a similar explanation.

If it be observed that according to this view there would be an error in the prophecy, both authors deny such an inference on the plea that the time of the Messiah's birth was not revealed to the prophet, but that the erroneous inference must be ascribed to his own private judgment. But if this be admitted as a true solution of the difficulty, it follows that in any prophecy we can hardly know what has been revealed by God to the prophet and what must be ascribed to his own private view on the subject.

**3. MESSIANIC NATURE OF THE PROPHECY.**—a. The Messianic character of the present prophecy appears first of all from the testimony of St. Matthew, i. 18-25: “. . . Now all this was done that it might be fulfilled which the Lord

spoke by the prophet, saying: Behold a virgin shall be with child . . .” There are two exceptions to this argument: 1. It is said that the first two chapters of St. Matthew’s gospel are spurious. But this can hardly be asserted without the greatest temerity, not to say without heresy. For the Tridentine and the Vatican councils (Trid. sess. iv., decret. de can. Script.; Vatic. sess. iii. c. 2) openly declare that the whole Bible, with all its parts, as it is contained in the old Vulgate edition, is sacred, canonical, and divinely inspired (Vat.); on the other hand, there is in our days no critic worthy of the name who rejects the first two chapters of St. Matthew’s gospel without rejecting all the rest.

2. The second exception against our inference that Isaias’ prophecy is Messianic because St. Matthew viewed it as such may be found in Isenbiehl (*Nener Versuch über die Weissagung vom Emmanuel*, 1778). The author assures us that the evangelist’s words, “that it might be fulfilled,” may indicate a mere accommodation of the prophecy to Christ’s conception. In support of this he appeals to St. Jerome’s saying (Ep. 103 ad Paulin., c. 7), that Socrates’ words were “fulfilled” in him: “I only know that I do not know.” Again, Isenbiehl endeavors to prove that St. Matthew repeatedly uses the formula “that it might be fulfilled” where he applies an Old Testament prophecy to our Lord by mere accommodation. Thus Matt. ii. 15 applies to Christ what Os. xi. 1 applies to the people of Israel; Matt. ii. 18 applies to the infants slain at Bethlehem what Jer. xxxi. 15 applies to the lamentations over the national misfortune in the Babylonian reverses; Matt. ii. 23 applies the words “he shall be called a Nazarite” as if they were prophetic of Jesus Christ, though they are nowhere to be found in the prophets; Matt. xiii. 13–15 applies to the following of Christ what Is. vi. 9, 10 had said of his own contemporaries.

Plausible as this exception may appear at first sight, it does not rest on solid ground. *α*. First of all, the author



who urges it does not distinguish between the typical and the literal meaning of the prophecies, and consequently he does not keep in mind that as the literal meaning of a prophecy is properly and not by mere accommodation applied to the people of Israel or to Old Testament occurrences, so may its typical sense be applied to Christ and to events of the Christian dispensation without on that account becoming a mere accommodation. In this manner St. Matthew (ii. 15, 18) applies the prophecies of Os. xi. 1 and Jer. xxxi. 15 to Christ's flight into Egypt and to the slaughter of the holy Innocents.  $\beta$ . Again, Isenbiehl is not aware that St. Matthew ii. 23 most probably reads "flower," and thus alludes to Isaias' prediction, xi. 1, where the future Messiah is called a flower from the root of Jesse.  $\gamma$ . In the third place, the author disregards the fact that a number of prophecies apply properly, not by mere accommodation, to a series of events rather than to any single fact of history. An instance of such a prediction we find, e.g., in II. Kings vii. 14, where the divine promises regard the whole line of David's descendants. They are not all fulfilled in every member of the series, but they are fully accomplished in the whole series taken collectively. Hence they may be properly and literally applied to any Davidic king. In the same manner St. Matthew applies Is. vi. 9, 10 to the unbelieving Jews in xiii. 13-15.

*b.* The second proof for the Messianic character of the prophecy is taken from the unanimous testimony of the Fathers on this point. A list of the patristic testimonies may be seen in Kilber's *Analysis Biblica* (editio altera, t. i. pp. 354 f.). There are again two main exceptions to this argument from the Fathers: 1. The Fathers speak on the false supposition that Isaias' prophecy rests on divine authority; 2. The Fathers express in their opinions on the present passage, not the doctrine of the Church, but their own private conviction.  $\alpha$ . As to the first exception, it suffices for our purpose to recall the decree of the Vatican Council (iii. 2), according to which the agreement of the

Fathers on a doctrinal point is in itself sufficient to command our assent, or at least to force us not to contradict the patristic testimony.  $\beta$ . As to the second exception, we must insist that the Fathers do not express their interpretation of the prophecy as a private opinion, but they represent it as the doctrine of the Church on a matter of Scripture interpretation, so that according to the council we are bound not to differ from it in substance. For though the Fathers may differ among themselves in details, they surely agree as to the main drift of the prophecy, giving it a Messianic signification.

*c.* The third argument for the Messianic character of Isaias' prophecy may be taken from the general agreement of this prediction with other evidently Messianic prophecies.

$\alpha$ . First of all, the very context of the prophecy bears witness to its Messianic nature. The child who is to be born, according to the seventh chapter, as a sign unto Achaz must naturally be expected to surpass in its nature any other sign that Achaz himself could have asked of God. Then in the next chapter it is announced in verse 8 that "the stretching out of his wings shall fill the breadth of thy land, O Emmanuel." If we compare the ninth chapter with this statement, it appears that Emmanuel shall be the Lord of the land of Juda. Since then at the time of the prophet none other than Achaz and Ezechiel were the lords of the land of Juda, to neither of whom the prediction could apply, we must suppose it applies to some one much above either of them—to the Messias himself. Again, in the ninth chapter, the prophet predicts salvation to the land of Juda through the child that is to be born. Now if this be not Emmanuel, of whom there is question in the seventh chapter, it must be Maher-Shalal, of the eighth chapter. But the latter was never king in Juda, nor did he ever perform any act that would be worthy of attention. Hence it is clear that the child who will save Juda is the Emmanuel of chapter seven. But the liberator of Juda is evidently identical with the Messias. Consequently,

the Emmanuel of our prophecy is the Messiah. In the eleventh chapter the prophet again returns to the rod that is to spring from the root of Jesse, to the most renowned offspring of David, whose reign will cause universal peace, under whose reign the Lord will possess the remnant of his chosen people. Now this one can be no other than the hero described in the ninth chapter, and the Emmanuel promised in the seventh chapter, i.e., the very Messiah (cf. ix. 2-4, and x. 20-22; Rom. ix. 27).

*β.* The Messianic reference of the present prophecy appears also when we compare it with the well-known prophecy of Micheas (v. 2 ff.) The similitude between the two predictions is so striking that we must admit either that Isaias reproduced the prophecy of Micheas, or that the latter repeated the prophetic promise of the former. Micheas says that God will give "them up even till the time wherein she that travaileth shall bring forth and the remnant of his brethren shall be converted to the children of Israel . . . and this man shall be our peace." How beautifully all this illustrates the prophecy of Isaias, if we suppose the latter prophet had about the same time uttered the prediction of the virgin's conception and her virginal child-birth! And, on the other hand, how clear the prophecy concerning the virgin and her son Emmanuel becomes if we suppose that Isaias alludes to the prophecy of Micheas which had recently been uttered (cf. Is. x. 20-22; xi. 11; iv. 3). But if Isaias speaks about a virgin concerning whom nothing else was known to the people of Israel, all becomes a riddle and an enigma. These five prophecies therefore form, as it were, one single whole; so much so that they have been regarded as constituting a single book—the book of Emmanuel. And if they be considered from this point of view, their Messianic character can hardly be called in question even by the most exacting of critics.

*d.* Three other arguments for the Messianic nature of

Isaias' prophecy are better omitted, since they are not altogether convincing.

*α.* For if it be urged that the child which is to be born will be the offspring of a virgin, and that this is a distinctly Messianic note, it must be remembered, on the other hand, that, prescind from the New Testament, it is not clear from the text of the prophecy whether the promised child will be the offspring of a virgin in any other sense than any first-born child is the offspring of a virgin. The virgin may be said by the prophet to conceive and to bring forth, as the blind are said to see, the deaf to hear, and the lame to walk. Nor can it be maintained that the virgin must remain a virgin in her conception and delivery, because otherwise there would be no sign which the prophet had promised to give. For the sign may consist in the wonderful nature of the child, or in several other particulars connected with the prediction, as will be seen in the course of the commentary.

*β.* Another argument for the Messianic character of the prediction is based on the fact that in the prophecy there is question of "*the* virgin;" the definite article, it is claimed, indicates that the virgin spoken of is virgin by excellence, and not merely as the mother of any first-born child is a virgin. But this consideration has not much weight, since the definite article in Hebrew has not necessarily that meaning, even when it is used with a noun that does not occur beforehand. For even in that case the noun is at times considered sufficiently known to require or, at least, to admit the definite article. This is seen in Gen. iii. 24: "and (he) placed before the paradise of pleasure Cherubim (Heb., the Cherubim)"; Ex. xv. 20: "So Mary the prophetess, the sister of Aaron, took a timbrel (Heb., the timbrel) in her hand;" Gen. xiv. 13: "and behold one that had escaped (Heb., the one that had escaped) told Abram the Hebrew."

*γ.* Other authors, again, have urged the following argument in favor of the Messianic character of Isaias'

prophecy: according to the Hebrew text it is the mother who will name the child Emmanuel; for we must either render "thou shalt call his name" (the phrase being a direct address to the mother), or "she shall call his name." Therefore, they say, Emmanuel has no human father who can perform this duty. But, on the other hand, we see in the Old Testament that the mother in several instances named her child, although its father was actually present (cf. Gen. iv. 1, 25; xix. 37; xxi. 32; xxx. 18 f.; xxx. 24; I. Kings i. 20, etc., exemplifying this statement).

*c.* But there is another proof for the Messianic reference of Isaias' prediction which cannot be omitted here; Jewish tradition considered the passage as referring to the promised Messias. In the first place, we may draw attention to the fact that St. Matthew applied the prophecy to Jesus Christ without any one contradicting him. And this is the more remarkable, since the Evangelist wrote his gospel for the Jews, proving to them the Messiaship of Jesus from the fulfilment of all the prophecies in his sacred person. Besides, we have the implicit avowal of the LXX. translators, who rendered the Hebrew word "virgin" in this prophecy, though in four other passages they had translated it by "woman." Then again the Hebrew as well as the other national traditions, according to which virginity is worthy of special honor, and which make their divine heroes sons of virgins, without the intercourse of man, show that Isaias' prophecy must have been understood by the ancients as referring to the birth of the future Redeemer.

#### Is. VII. 1-17.

And it came to pass in the days of Achaz the son of Joathan, the son of Ozias king of Juda, that Rasin king of Syria, and Phacee the son of Romelia king of Israel, came up to Jerusalem, to fight against it; but they could not prevail over it. And they told the house of David, saying: "Syria hath rested upon Ephraim;" and his heart was moved, and the heart of his people, as the trees of the woods are moved with the wind. And the

Lord said to Isaias : <sup>1</sup> "Go forth to meet Achaz, thou and Jasub thy son that is left, at the end of the conduit of the upper pool, in the way of the fuller's field." <sup>2</sup> And thou shalt say to him :

<sup>1</sup> **Go forth to meet Achaz.** The first sentences of Isaias' account are clear from the historical paragraphs that have been premised to this prophecy. While Rasin besieged Elath, Phacee had endeavored to deal with the capital ; "but they could not prevail." After Elath had fallen into Rasin's hands, the latter joined his troops with those of Phacee, "Syria hath rested upon Ephraim," whereupon Achaz' heart was moved and the heart of his people, as the trees of the woods are moved with the wind. Preparations for a serious and protracted siege must now be made at Jerusalem ; hence Achaz is occupied near the upper pool from which the city had to receive the greatest part of its water supply. The fuller's field, i.e., their washing or bleaching-place, lay either on the western side of the city (Robinson, Schultz, van Raumer, Thenius, Unruh, Schick, etc.), or, according to a less probable opinion, to the northeast (Williams, Kraft, Meier, Hitzig, etc.). To this place, then, the prophet was told to repair, together with Jasub, or Shear-Jasub, his son. The very names of the two visitors were read symbols of their divine mission. Isaias, meaning "salvation of the Lord," announces the hopeful character of the visitation, while "Shear-Jasub," meaning "the remnant shall return," or "the remnant is converted," is in itself a commentary on Is. vi. 11-13, and combines in a brief summary God's threats and promises. There will be final safety for Israel, but only for its remnant, so that the divine curse in a manner precedes the divine blessing.

<sup>2</sup> **And thou shalt say to him.** The divine message to Achaz may be divided into three parts : 1. God warns the king to "be quiet," i.e., not to act precipitately, and not to be afraid of the two tails of these fire-brands, i.e., the two fag-ends of wood-pokers, half burned off and wholly burned out, so that they do not burn, but keep on smoking. 2. In the second place God gives Achaz a prophecy in order to show him that his advice indicates the proper course to follow. In the introduction to this prediction the prophet summarizes the whole situation of the three kings ; then he assures Achaz in general terms that the intentions of the king of Syria and of Samaria will not be put into practice : "It shall not stand, and this shall not be !" After this general prediction, Isaias adds three more prophecies regarding the special fate of the three kingdoms concerned. *a.* Syria is to gain nothing by the undertaking. It will be in future, as it has been in the past : "the head of Syria is Damascus, and the head of Damascus is Rasin." *b.* Regarding Samaria the prophet utters a double prediction : the first has reference to the far-off future, "within threescore and five years Ephraim shall cease to be a people ;" the second is concerned with the immediate future of the northern kingdom, "the head of Ephraim is Samaria, and the head of Samaria the son of Romelia."

It may be noted in passing that the sixty-five years assigned to the time of Samaria's final destruction do not end with the beginning of the Assyrian captivity, which began in 722 B.C., but terminate at the



“See thou be quiet; fear not, and let not thy heart be afraid of the two tails of these firebrands, smoking with the wrath of the fury of Rasin king of Syria and of the son of Romelia. Because Syria with the son of Romelia hath taken counsel against thee, unto the evil of Ephraim, saying: Let us go up to Juda, and rouse it up, and draw it away to us and make the son of Tabeel

time when Assyrian settlers were colonizing Samaria under the reign of Asarhaddon. For since the present prophecy was uttered in the beginning of Achaz' reign, the 14 years of that king, together with the 29 years of his successor Ezechias and the 22 years which his successor Manasses ruled before he was carried off to the land of his exile, will give about the required number of 65 years. We know that this explanation of the 65 years rests on several suppositions that are not absolutely certain; they are, however, sufficiently probable to justify our conjecture. For though the year in which Samaria was thus colonized is not certain, it seems very natural that this should have taken place after the defeat of Manasses, which the Talmud in the tract “Seder Olam” places in the 22d year of Manasses' reign.

This explanation, in itself very probable, becomes still more so when compared with other attempts of interpretation that have been given concerning the passage. *α.* For some contend that the term from which the 65 years must be reckoned is the time when Amos (vii. 11, 17) gave utterance to his prophecy, i.e., the 25th year of Ozias. The term at which the 65 years end is the 6th year of Ezechias, when Samaria was subdued in war and ceased to be a kingdom. The 65 years are, then: 27 under Ozias, 16 under Joathan, 16 under Achaz, and 6 under Ezechias (Euseb., Procop., Barh., Haimo, St. Thom., Malv., Pint., Mald., Lap., Mar., Gordon, Schegg, and certain Jewish commentators). It is plain that this exposition of the text hardly agrees with the words of Isaias. *β.* Another way of interpreting the 65 years is found in Sanchez, Rohling, Oppert, etc.; according to this view the years refer to the past, so that the term to which they bring us is the 27th year of Jeroboam II., when Samaria was for 10 years deprived of its independence by Syria. The sense of the passage is then that, as in the past Samaria has suffered reverses in war, so it will in the future be entirely destroyed. But the Hebrew particle that precedes the number 65 points to the future rather than to the past (*be'od*). *γ.* There is still another class of interpreters who explain the difficulty by endeavoring to remove it entirely; the second part of verse 8 is, according to these authors, to be expunged from the text as an interpolation. The principal reasons for this opinion are reduced to the following: the prophecy becomes too definite by the number 65, and the second member of verse 8 destroys the metrical harmony and poetic parallelism of the passage (Eichhorn, Gesenius, Maurer, Hitzig, Ewald, Umbreit, Dietrich). On the other hand, the exact number of years stated by the prophet cannot seem objectionable to any one who admits the supernatural character of the prediction. The phraseology of *Sb.* is in strict accord with that of Isaias in other passages (cf. xxi. 16; xvii. 1; xxv. 2).

king in the midst thereof :” thus saith the Lord God : “ It shall not stand, and this shall not be ! But the head of Syria is Damascus, and the head of Damaseus is Rasin, and within threescore and five years Ephraim shall cease to be a people. And the head of Ephraim is Samaria, and the head of Samaria the son of Romelia. If you will not believe, you shall not continue.”

The parallelism rather demands than excludes the second part of verse 8, since it will be seen that concerning Juda too the prophet predicts both the immediate and the far-off state of affairs (cf. Delitzsch, i. pp. 199 ff.; Knabenb., i. p. 156).

c. The third prophecy which the seer utters concerns Juda, indicating the general method which the Lord will follow in his future dealings with that state ; it is both threatening and conditional in its nature. “ If you do not believe, you shall not continue.” The only condition, then, on which Juda can retain its political independence is full trust in God ; Assyrian help will be no safeguard against political destruction.

3. The third part of Isaias’ prophetic mission to Achaz consists in trying whether Juda does trust the Lord. Juda is represented by the actual head of David’s royal house,—by Achaz,—so that on Achaz’ faith or unfaith depends the safety of the theocracy. (God’s decree is : If Juda does not believe, it shall not continue. But does Juda believe ? The trial will show it. “ Ask thee a sign of the Lord thy God.” If the sign is asked, this will prove a sufficient token of Juda’s trust in the Lord God. But Juda answers in its representative : “ I will not ask, and I will not tempt the Lord.” The king’s hypocritical answer decides the fate of Juda for more than two thousand years, as far as our experience goes. Alluding to Deut. vi. 16, where presumption is forbidden, Achaz seeks in that passage a cloak for his continuance in his Assyrian policy. Deliverance he desires, but does not expect or wish it through God’s help.

Juda’s trial over, the prophet announces more in particular the future fate of the kingdom. More in particular, we say, because it has been announced already in general terms. “ If you do not believe, you shall not continue.” But you do not believe. Therefore you shall not continue. The detailed description of Juda’s future regards first its far-off future ; secondly, its nearer future. *a.* As to the far-off future of Juda, the child Emmanuel, who shall be born of the well-known virgin, the stay, the hope, the crowning glory of David’s royal house, “ shall eat butter and honey,” i.e., he shall live in the country of butter and honey, outside of Juda, and consequently in exile ; and he shall eat butter and honey, the food of the poor and the lowly, so that at his time the royal house of David will be reduced to poverty and exile. *b.* In the immediate future the fate of Juda will be varied. before the child that is appealed to would attain the use of reason, if it were born here and now, the two hostile kings will have disappeared from the confines of Juda ; but since Achaz has been found wanting in faith, the Assyrian, in whom he trusts, will invade Juda and make it the battle-ground between his and the Egyptian armies.

And the Lord spoke again to Achaz, saying: "Ask thee<sup>3</sup> a

<sup>3</sup>A sign. The prophecy speaks of a double sign: 1. Achaz is invited to ask for a sign; 2. the prophet himself gives a sign. Both signs call for a word of explanation. 1. Isaias invites Achaz to ask for a sign. *a.* Hitzig maintains that the prophet here "played a dangerous game," in which the Lord would surely have "left him in the lurch," if the king had chosen to ask for a sign. Meier observes that it cannot have entered the prophet's mind to wish for a miracle. De Lagarde says that the failure of his sign would have subjected the prophet to punishment for lying. But all these are mere *a priori* arguments, resting on the supposition that miracles do not happen. *b.* Omitting the question whether we ought to render the prophet's words "ask it either in the depth or in the height above" or "make it deep unto Sheol or heighten it to on high," it must suffice to enumerate a few opinions regarding the nature of the offered sign. *α.* Choose between seeing the earth split down to the abyss of hell, and beholding the heavens opened to the throne of the Most High (Haimo, Pint., Sasb., Lap., Men.) *β.* The sign in the heavens might be similar to that granted to Josue (Jos. x. 12), or to the thunder, the storm, and the fire which occurred in the days of Samuel and Elias (I. Kings xii. 17, IV. Kings i. 10), while the sign in the deep might resemble the destruction of Core, Dathan and Abiron, or the death of the Egyptians in the Red Sea, or again the miraculous deliverance of Jonas from the belly of the great fish (Basil, Procop., Thom., Sanch., Calmet).

2. The prophet promises a sign in spite of, or rather because of, Achaz' refusal to ask for one. Explanations. *a.* Delitzsch (p. 210) is of opinion that the sign consists in the mystery which surrounds the prediction about the pregnant virgin bringing forth a son—a mystery which threatens the house of David, and which affords comfort to the prophet and to all believers. It hardly needs proof that such a mystery is, at best, a very unsatisfactory explanation of the promised sign. *b.* The sign consists in the prophet's prediction that a certain virgin would conceive in her first intercourse with man, that she would give birth to a son rather than a daughter, and that this son would be called Emmanuel—a name which resembled in its symbolic meaning the names of Isaias' two sons. *α.* But, according to this explanation, Emmanuel is entirely distinct from the Messias, which contradicts the above proofs for the Messianic character of the prophecy. *β.* Again, history knows nothing of a son called Emmanuel whose age of discretion was accompanied by the liberation of Juda from the kings of Syria and Samaria. *c.* The sign consists in the prediction of Juda's liberation from the oppression of its enemies. *α.* But the whole context would in this manner become extremely insipid and meaningless. *β.* Besides, the sign is intended to strengthen the king's faith in the divine promise of Juda's future liberation, and can therefore be hardly identified with this prophetic promise. *d.* The sign consists wholly in the fact that a virgin, remaining virgin, will conceive and give birth to a son—the very Emmanuel, or the promised Messias. *α.* This explanation supposes that the sign that God gives to Achaz is a wholly favorable sign. Now

sign of the Lord thy God, either unto the depth of hell or unto

it appears from the context that this cannot be the case. Juda has not believed; therefore it will not continue; therefore "the Lord himself shall give a sign" to Juda. *β.* The sign must represent the double character of God's dealing with David's royal house: he will chastise it with the rod of men, but will not take away his mercy from it. Now the fact that the Messiah will be born of a virgin, remaining a virgin in his conception and birth illustrates only God's mercy to the house of David, but does not exhibit his justice. *ε.* The sign consists partially in the virginal birth of the Messiah, but partially also in his having to eat butter and honey, i.e., in his having to live far away from the capital of his ancestors in poverty and exile. The composite character of this sign satisfies the two essential conditions which it requires: *α.* God's mercy will not depart from David's royal house, since the Messiah will be born indeed. *β.* God will, however, chastise the royal house of Juda, since its worldly glory will be humbled to the dust of the earth. *γ.* The phrase "he shall eat butter and honey" implies such a state of humiliation as is required by the context. For "butter and honey" means either the thickened milk and honey, which are the usual food of the tenderest age of childhood (Gesenius, Hengstenberg, etc.), or the food that is usually taken in the desert (Delitzsch). Now the former of these two meanings is excluded by the sentences that follow the phrase "he shall eat butter and honey." For in them the child is, on the one hand, represented as eating the assigned food up to the years of discretion, and, on the other, the land before whose two kings Achaz is in terror will before the same period of time be laid waste, so that only the food of the desert will remain (cf. Delitzsch, pp. 210 f.).

There are, however, two main difficulties against this explanation of the prophecy: 1. The Messiah will be born more than 700 years after the date of the prediction. His virginal conception and birth, and his poverty and humility cannot then be given as a sign to the contemporaries of Isaiah. 2. According to the text Rasin and Phacee will leave Judea before the child shall attain his years of discretion; now this happened within two years after the prediction. Again, according to verse 22, Judea itself shall be devastated, so that "butter and honey shall every one eat that shall be left in the midst of the land." Emmanuel too shall share this fate, as appears from the connection of the prophecy. Now Judea's devastation by the Assyrians happened after they had laid waste the kingdoms of Syria and Samaria. Hence it seems that the promised Emmanuel must have been born immediately after the time of the prophecy.

Different answers have been given to both difficulties. Answers to the first exception: *a.* The sign must precede the event in confirmation of which it is given when there is question of a common miraculous sign; but in the case of a prophecy, when the one who utters the prediction is generally acknowledged as a prophet, it is not necessary that the fulfilment precede the event in confirmation of which it is given. Similar instances we find in I. Kings x. 2-8; Ex. iii. 12; IV. Kings xix. 29; Is. xxxvii. 30. In the case of Isaiah we may add the following consideration: It might well be that the

the height above." And Achaz said: "I will not ask, and I will

king and the people generally acknowledged the prophetic character of Isaias in religious matters, and in matters connected with the future Redeemer, but did not acknowledge the divine character of his political mission to Achaz. Since he, therefore, did not find faith in the latter among his contemporaries, he confirmed his divine mission by a Messianic prophecy. It is clear that such a sign needed not to be seen or verified by experience in order to have its full effect with those whom the prophet addressed, still, there are authors who refer us to the experience which the prophet's hearers were to have in limbo of the prophecy's fulfilment (Jo. viii. 56).

b. Drach follows St. Chrysostom (Lettres d'un Rabbin converti, 3e. lettre, pp. 30, 31) and Theodoret in explaining the sign as one that necessarily implies the thing signified. The two hostile kings, they say, were about to exterminate the house of David (Is. vii. 6), in order to make Tabeel king instead of Achaz. The prophet comes with the assurance that the enemies will so poorly succeed in their attempt that the house of David will even after seven hundred years give birth to the promised Messiah. But it may be observed:  $\alpha$ . that the two hostile kings did not necessarily wish to exterminate the whole house of David in order to accomplish their design;  $\beta$ . that the salvation of the house of David does not necessarily imply Achaz' deliverance from his two enemies at the juncture for which the prophet predicted it;  $\gamma$ . according to this explanation the prophet would have had to foretell in clear language the Messiah's descent from David's royal house. Though this may be gathered from Is. ix. and xi., it is not clearly stated in Is. vii.

c. A third answer to the difficulty has been offered by Hengstenberg. According to this author, with whom Corluy appears to agree (Spicil. i. p. 409), the prophet's argument is *a fortiori*, so that we may propose it in this manner: God will give to the house of David the very Emmanuel, the son of the virgin; therefore, he will not refuse it what is much less—liberation from its present enemies. A similar manner of reasoning we find in Rom. viii. 32; in point of fact, the prophet's inference was truly logical: the future Messiah was the source of all blessings for the whole human race, and therefore we find that both Isaias and Ezechiel console the people with similar reasonings under the most trying circumstances. But on the other hand, this explanation by far exceeds the obvious meaning of the passage, and should not be accepted without necessity. The first answer seems to be, after all, the most satisfactory.

The second difficulty finds a contradiction between the context of the prediction and its Messianic interpretation, because according to the latter the virgin's son must be born after seven centuries, while according to the former the virgin's son must be born in the immediate future. There is no need of repeating here the divers explanations of this difficulty which deny the Messianic character of the prediction, since they have been duly considered in the preceding paragraphs. We shall limit ourselves to a few explanations that may be admitted by Catholic theologians:

a. Rich. Simon, B. Lamy, Huetius, Moldenhauer, Tirinus, etc.,



not tempt the Lord." And he said : " Hear ye therefore, O house

distinguish here, as in other prophecies, between the literal and the typical sense of the prediction. In the literal sense, Emmanuel is *Isaias'* son who was called *Mahershalal-chashbaz* (Is. viii. 3); the virgin is the prophetess whom *Isaias* had married when she was a virgin (Is. viii. 3). This explanation is based on the following reasons : *α.* Almost immediately after the prediction of the boy's conception and birth, the prophet describes the conception and birth of *Mahershalal*, before whose attaining the years of discretion the land was freed from its two oppressors, as *Isaias* has foretold about Emmanuel (Is. viii. 1-3). *β.* In Is. viii. 18 the prophet explicitly appeals to his two sons, whom God had given him as a sign for Israel. *γ.* The fact that *Isaias'* son of whom he speaks viii. 1-3 is not called Emmanuel does not contradict the explanation, since Emmanuel signified rather the present help of God than the actual name of the child to be born ; this must occasion so much the less difficulty, since not even Jesus received actually all the names that had been given him in Is. ix. 6. According to this view the words " he shall eat butter and honey " mean only that Emmanuel will be nourished with the food usually given to children, until he will know how to refuse the evil and to choose the good. *δ.* In accordance with the same view Emmanuel typically signifies the Messiah, as the virgin mother is a type of the Blessed Virgin, conceiving and giving birth to her son without detriment to her virginity. The liberation of Judea is the type of the Messianic salvation from the yoke of sin and satan.

Still, there are various considerations apt to make us dissatisfied with this explanation. *α.* In the first place, the type must properly represent its antitype, in that wherein it is a type. Now, a married woman, conceiving in the ordinary, natural manner, does not properly represent a virginal conception and a virginal motherhood. Nevertheless, St. Matthew testifies that *Isaias'* prophecy was fulfilled precisely in the virginal conception of Jesus Christ. Consequently, the prophetic passage cannot literally apply to a married woman, such as the wife of *Isaias* was. Nor can it be said that St. Matthew had no intention of insisting in his gospel on the virginal conception of Jesus, but that he merely insists on his being conceived of the Holy Ghost, and that he thus argued from the conception of Emmanuel, who too was conceived through the special mediatorship of God. For this exception is against the whole context of the Evangelist. St. Matthew tells us how the angel solved St. Joseph's doubt concerning the mysterious pregnancy of the Blessed Virgin. The revelation of her virginal conception alone could fully allay St. Joseph's anxiety regarding this matter. Besides all this, the Fathers insist repeatedly that *Isaias'* prophecy has been fulfilled by the virginal conception of the Son of God.

*β.* Then, again, the son of *Isaias* by the prophetess cannot be the Emmanuel mentioned in *Isaias* vii. For it is highly improbable that one and the same child should have received, at the express wish of God, two entirely different symbolical names. Nor can the prophetess be the virgin mentioned in the prophecy ; for the view that *Isaias* married after the present prophecy a virgin with whom he



of David : Is it a small thing for you to be grievous to men, that

had intercourse rests on nothing but a mere conjecture, which in itself is most improbable. And if Emmanuel's mother was identical with Maher-Shalal's mother, why should not Isaias have said : " Behold, the prophetess shall conceive . . ." ? or what could have prevented his saying : " and I went to the virgin . . ." ? Besides, there seems to be no point of resemblance between Maher-Shalal, the son of Isaias, and Emmanuel, born of the root of Jesse, inheriting the throne of David forever. Nor can Calmet maintain that Jesus' not being called Emmanuel favors his manner of interpretation. For Jesus does not on that account become equal to the son of Isaias. Emmanuel, applied to the Messias, shows what the Messias is, while the same name applied to the son of the prophet only indicates the symbolical meaning of the child.

b. Drach (l. c.) and Marani (*De divinitate Christi*, p. 36) have therefore endeavored to solve the difficulty in a manner different from Calmet's answer. According to them the 15th verse alone is Messianic, while the boy of whom there is question in the following verse is Shear-Jasub, the son of the prophet. These authors admit that the prophet, after announcing the virginal conception and birth of Emmanuel, after predicting his eating butter and honey in order to show that he is a man like ourselves, suddenly changed his attitude, and pointing with his hand to Shear-Jasub uttered the prediction : Before that boy shall attain to the years of discretion, the land whose two kings thou fearest shall be vacated by its inhabitants.

They urge a number of reasons for their interpretation, which are answered without much difficulty : *α.* Unless this explanation is admitted, there is no reason why Isaias should have been commanded to take Shear-Jasub with him to Achaz. But the very name of the boy was a sufficient reason for this command, since the name of both father and son served as a symbolic prophecy to the unhappy king. *β.* As to the assertion that the prophet should have used the word " child " and not " boy," had he referred in the 16th verse to the Emmanuel, it can claim only an apparent probability. Its fallacy becomes clear as soon as one reflects that Emmanuel at the age at which the prophet refers to him is no more a child. *γ.* The circumstance that Shear-Jasub too had been given to the prophet for a sign serves only to confirm what we said above ; the child's mere presence was a sign to the king. *δ.* The last reason urged by these authors in favor of their explanation only shows the weakness of their position. For though prophets may and do make sudden transitions from subject to subject, still this peculiarity of theirs is limited to type and antitype. And even when they treat of matters so intimately related to each other as type and antitype are, the context commonly shows, at least, signs of the transition. In the present passage of Isaias there is not only no sign of such a transition, but there is not even question of connected subjects ; for it would be difficult to prove that Shear-Jasub is a type of Emmanuel. *ε.* Besides all this, the connection of the 16th verse with what precedes and follows is so close that it hardly admits such a sudden transition from Emmanuel to Shear-Jasub. In fact the 16th verse

you are grievous to my God also? Therefore the Lord himself

begins with the causal particle "ki" (כִּי); so that it must contain the reason of the preceding statement. The language used by the prophet forbids the belief that he pointed out the boy of whom he spoke; for had he done so, he should have said: "hanna'ar hazzeh," and not merely "hanna'ar." Finally, in the 22d verse it appears that Emmanuel himself is in some way supposed to be present in the desolated territory, and to be among those who will have to eat butter and honey after the destruction of Achaz' kingdom. The suggested explanation would therefore leave the difficulty unanswered.

c. Vitranga (Comment. in Is. in h. l.; *Observat. sacræ*, l. v.) and Patrizi have suggested another solution of the difficulty. According to them there is no connection between vv. 15 and 22; the former tells us that Emmanuel will indeed eat butter and honey as a sign of his true humanity, but that his years of discretion constitute only an ideal term before which the predicted liberation will take place, since the terminus from which the years must be reckoned is not the real but the ideal birth of Emmanuel, i. e., the moment at which the prophecy is uttered. It is true that the prophet clearly distinguishes the stated two periods both in the life of Achaz and in that of Emmanuel. The difficulty of the prophecy consists precisely in the prophet's referring the distance between the two terms in both cases to the same period of time, so that the term from which the time up to Achaz' delivery must be reckoned coincides with the conception and birth of Emmanuel, while the time of the actual delivery of Achaz precedes Emmanuel's age of discretion. Now this point is not sufficiently kept in view in the solution offered by the authors mentioned before. Besides, their assumption that vv. 15 and 22 are not connected contradicts the testimony of the text itself.

d. Bossuet (*Explication de la prophétie d'Isaïe*, vii. 14) proposes another solution of the question. According to him the prophet mingles type with antitype in the passage, or rather he mixes the part which refers literally to the Messiah with that which refers to him only typically. Literally, the Messiah is referred to only in the words: "Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and his name shall be called Emmanuel." Everything else refers literally to Isaias' son Maher-Shalal, who is the type of the Messiah. The transition from antitype to type is evident from the divine attributes which are predicated of the former, and the human characteristics attributed to the latter. But there are certain considerations which render Bossuet's explanation very improbable. α. First, it is hard to find out any similitude between Maher-Shalal and Emmanuel in those precise points with regard to which the former must be the type of the latter. We need not repeat what we have said about the impossibility of the virginal conception and birth of Emmanuel being typically represented by the conception and birth of Maher-Shalal. β. Besides, it seems highly improbable that Isaias' son should be called by two different names in the same passage; the one applying to him in his historical bearing, the other representing him in his typical capacity.

e. Hengstenberg in his *Christology*, Knabenbauer in his *Commen-*

shall give you a sign. <sup>4</sup> Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear

tary on the present passage, and Corluy (Spicil. i. p. 418) prefer another solution of the difficulty.  $\alpha$ . According to these authors, the prophet uses in the present passage the figure of vision; he sees in his prophetic vision Emmanuel's conception and birth as happening there and then. The years of Achaz' delivery from his enemies are, therefore, rightly reckoned from the moment at which the prediction is uttered or from the birth of Emmanuel; Emmanuel is rightly represented as eating butter and honey with his afflicted fellow-citizens; the delivery, finally, takes place before Emmanuel attains to the use of his reason.  $\beta$ . Such a vivid description we meet in Is. ix. 6, where the prophet represents the Emmanuel as already born; the manner of thus identifying the Messias with the actual condition of his people is perfectly legitimate, since all the salvation of Israel was derived from the merits of the Messias.  $\gamma$ . As to the exception which may be urged against this explanation, that such a figure could not have been understood by Achaz and his contemporaries, it must be remembered that the Israelites were by other prophecies, uttered about the same time and by the same prophet, clearly forewarned that the Messianic salvation would come only after a very long space of time. In chapter xi., e.g., there is question of the root giving birth to the promised Redeemer, and in the same chapter (v. 12) the prophet distinctly announces that Israel and Juda will have to suffer dispersion and national ruin before the period of the Messias.

<sup>4</sup> Behold a virgin. Explanations: 1. The virgin is no definite person at all: according to Duhm, mother and son are merely representative ideas; according to Reuss the virgin is "*la femme comme telle*;" according to Henry Hammond (1653), pregnancy, birth, and maturity are in their primary sense only parabolical facts, subservient to the chronological measurement of time, while Lowth, Koppe, Gratz, I. D. Michaelis, Eichhorn, Paulus, Staehelin, Hensler, Ammon, etc., maintain that the prophet's words are merely conditional, meaning that if a virgin were to conceive now, and bring forth a child, he would attain the use of reason only after the land would be freed from its two powerful enemies. But all this contradicts the positive statement of the prophet, which admits no condition. It is also opposed to Is. viii. 8, which demands that the virgin applies to a definite person.

2. The house of David is the virgin, and her son is a future new Israel as it is represented in Is. liv. 4-7 (Hofmann, Ebrard, Köhler, Weir); or the congregation of the pious and of the God-fearing in Israel at the time of Achaz is the virgin who will bring about a future reformation of the nation (Schultz), or the Church is the virgin who will bring forth a countless number of children to God and his Redeemer (Herveus; the author proposes this only as a secondary and mystical meaning of the prophecy, after he has explained it literally of the Messias). But not to mention other inconveniences, this explanation is opposed to Is. viii. 8, 10; ix. 6, and also to the common figurative manner of the prophet's address to the people, which he never calls simply "virgin."

3. The prophet must, therefore, speak of a definite physical person

a son, and his name shall be called Emmanuel. He shall eat

in the present passage. Some of the ancient Jewish commentators who are mentioned by the Fathers (Justin. cont. Tryph. nn. 66, 68, 71, 77; Cyr, Proc, Jerome) understood the word "virgin" as applying to Achaz' wife, the mother of Ezechias, whom they identified with Emmanuel. This view is clearly refuted by Driver (Isaias, p. 40). According to IV. Kings xvi. 2, Achaz on ascending the throne was twenty years old, and according to IV. Kings xviii. 2, Ezechias was twenty-five years old on his ascending the throne. Now, according to III. Kings xvi. 2, Achaz reigned sixteen years, and the present prophecy was uttered in the beginning of his reign. Ezechias was, therefore, nine years old at the time when Isaias uttered the prophecy. If it be said that according to this calculation Achaz died at the age of thirty-six, and that he therefore was only eleven years older than Ezechias, who ascended the throne at the age of twenty-five, we answer that according to the LXX. and the Pesh., Achaz was twenty-five on ascending the throne, so that he died at the age of forty-one, and became father of Ezechias at the age of sixteen. But this does not affect the fact that Ezechias was several years old when Isaias announced the divine sign to the godless Achaz.

4. Some of the later Jewish commentators, as Abarbanel and Kimchi, are of opinion that the virgin refers to another wife of Achaz, not to the mother of Ezechias, and that Emmanuel is a son of Achaz who is unknown in history. But since this view is gratuitously asserted, it may be denied without an express statement of the reasons for the denial. Besides, it is extremely improbable that a common child, who was to have no special natural or supernatural prerogatives, should be the subject of Is. viii. 8, 10; ix. 6, etc.

5. Another class of authors holds that the virgin of the prophecy is the wife of Isaias, either the mother of Shear-Jasub, or a younger wife, newly married to the prophet, who became the mother of Maher-Shalal. The latter is, according to this view, the Emmanuel of the prophecy (Aben-Ezra, Jarchi, Faustus Socinus, Crell, Grotius, von Wolzogen, Faber, Pflüschke, Gesenius, Hitzig, Hendewerk, Knobel, Maurer, Olshausen, Diestel, etc.). It may be noted that certain Catholic authors have given assent to this opinion, applying, however, only the literal sense of virgin and Emmanuel to the prophet's wife and son, while they understand both in their typical meaning of the Messiah and his virgin mother (cf. St. Jerome's opinion about those who adhere to this view). *α.* But how can we conceive Isaias addressing his own son as the Lord of the land of Juda, and how can he represent his son as the cause of Israel's liberation from its enemies (Is. viii. 8, 10)? *β.* Again, the hypothesis that the prophecy refers to a wife of Isaias recently married to him is nothing but a makeshift, resting on no single positive argument, while the assumption that Isaias indicated by "virgin" the mother of Shear-Jasub contradicts the very name given to her. For whatever meaning may be assigned to the Hebrew word "‘almah," it can surely not be applied to a married woman who has had children.

6. Castalio, Isenbiehl (formerly), Bauer, Cube, Stendel, Umbreit (formerly), and H. Schultz maintain that the prophet addressed his words

butter and honey, that he may know to refuse the evil, and to

to a virgin who happened to be present at the time of the prophecy. Pointing to her, Isaias predicted that she should conceive and bear a son, and that the country should be freed from its enemies before her son would reach the age of discretion.  $\alpha$ . It has already been shown that the sign thus offered can in no way satisfy the context of the prophecy.  $\beta$ . Not to mention that the authors who hold this view do not give any proof, they contradict what the prophet says concerning the Emmanuel in viii. 8, 10; for it is incredible that the lord of Judea and the liberator of his native country should have remained as unknown to history as is the virgin's son of whom Isaias is supposed to prophesy in the present passage.

7. If this be true of the explanation according to which any immaculate virgin and her son are the subjects of the prophet's prediction, what are we to think of Nägelsbach's opinion, which contends that a sinful woman and a child born of sinful intercourse are the virgin and the Emmanuel of whom Isaias speaks? The virgin is a daughter of Achaz, who has conceived secretly, and whose sin is as yet unknown to her father. Isaias reveals her shame to her father, and thus offers him a divine sign of his supernatural mission and of God's faithfulness to his promises. The incongruity of this explanation is so clear that it needs no further refutation.

8. Finally, the commonly received opinion of Catholics maintains that the "virgin" in Isaias' prophecy refers to the Blessed Virgin in its literal sense, and that Emmanuel refers in its literal meaning to Jesus Christ. The text of the prophecy, its context, and its traditional interpretation render this explanation certain beyond dispute.

$\alpha$ . The text of the passage: In the text we shall first consider the word "virgin," Heb. "almah"; secondly, we shall say a word about the clause in which the word "virgin" occurs. 1. As to "almah," whatever etymological derivation we give for the word (אַלְמָה, אִלְמָה), in any case it may signify a chaste virgin, so far as its derivation is concerned. Now the Scriptural *usage* of the word determines that, in point of fact, "almah" does mean "virgin." For it occurs only six times in the Old Testament outside of the present passage; in Gen. xxiv. 43 it is applied to Rebecca, who is expressly called a virgin who had not known man (Gen. xxiv. 16); Ex. ii. 8 applies 'almah to the sister of Moses, who was only a little girl; Ps. lxxvii. (lxxviii.) 26 reads "princes went before joined with singers, in the midst of young damsels playing on timbrels." Now we infer from Jer. xxxi. 4; Judges xi. 34; Ex. xv. 20 that the damsels employed in this office were commonly virgins. Cant. i. 3 uses the word of virgins who love their royal spouse where no meaning but that of pure virgins can be thought of. Cant. vi. 8 (Vogl. 7) has the passage: "There are three score queens, and four score concubines, and young maidens without number." Here again, it is clear that the young maidens indicated in the Hebrew text by the plural of 'almah must be pure virgins, since they are distinguished from queens on the one hand, and from concubines on the other. The sixth passage in which "almah" occurs offers greater difficulties. It reads: "Three things are hard to me, and the fourth I am utterly ignorant of: the way



choose the good. For before the child know to refuse the evil,

of an eagle in the air, the way of a serpent upon a rock, the way of a ship in the midst of the sea, and the way of a man in youth" (Prov. xxx. 18, 19). The word rendered "youth" reads in the Hebrew text "'almah," so that we should read "the way of a man in a virgin." Only one Hebrew codex has the reading "'almuth" that is required by the present English, Latin, Septuagint, and Syriac rendering "youth;" all the other codices and old versions require the rendering "virgin."

A number of explanations of this difficult passage have been offered, which we can only enumerate without fully investigating any one of them.

α. The "virgin" spoken of is a prostitute, so that the whole passage means: as there is no sign left of the eagle's way in the air, of the serpent's path on the rock, and of the ship's course in the waters of the sea, so there is no certain sign of a man's intercourse with a prostitute. 1. But in the first place, the subsequent pregnancy would serve as such a sign. 2. Again, this meaning does not agree with the verse which immediately follows the passage: "Such is also the way of an adulterous woman, who eateth, and wipeth her mouth, and saith: I have done no evil." For what imaginable "way" of the adulterous woman can thus be compared with the way of the eagle, the serpent, the ship, and the man?

β. A second explanation admits that "'almah" in the passage may mean a "virgin" who is immaculate before her intercourse with man. This view supposes that man's way in the virgin is hidden because it cannot be discovered on the man himself. 1. But in the first place, this explanation is against the analogy of the preceding three unknown ways: they are called unknown, not because they cannot be detected on the eagle, or the ship, or the serpent, but because they cannot be discovered in the air, in the sea, and on the rock. In the same manner, then, must the fourth way be undiscoverable on the virgin. 2. Besides, the same argument may be urged against this explanation which we urged against the first solution, and which was taken from the impossibility of finding an analogous "way" of the adulterous woman.

γ. Others again have thought of explaining the passage in a metaphorical sense; the Wise Man says, according to this view: I do not know how the mighty eagle can sail through the thin air; I do not know how the serpent without feet can glide over the solid rock; I do not know how the bulky ship can be upheld in the liquid waters of the ocean; I do not know how the libertine can be impelled by his impure passion to corrupt the immaculate virgin: and in the same manner the deceitful way of the adulterous woman is a mystery to me. It is clear that according to this explanation all the necessary conditions of both text and context are fully satisfied.

δ. There is another explanation which seems more satisfactory to some scholars, because it does not appeal to a metaphorical meaning of the word "way." The 'almah is supposed to be a chaste virgin,—at least in the estimation of men,—and the writer insists on the fact that even in a virgin there is no certain sign of her intercourse with



and to choose the good, the land which thou abhorrest shall be

man. As, therefore, an adulterous woman may eat and wipe her mouth and say, "I have done no evil," so may a reputed virgin, even after her sin, be without any outward signs of her violated virginity (cf. Knab. p. 170).

ε. We hardly need to state all the other explanations that have been attempted by divers authors: Rohling, e.g., proffers the view that the writer merely warns virgins against illicit intercourse, since they alone have to bear the punishment and the shame, while their accomplices retain no trace of the sin; Hengstenberg explains the "way" of man in the virgin as meaning the curious manner in which a virgin often conceives a passion for a man without any assignable reasonable cause; Lapede mentions the opinion of some that the writer addresses a warning to parents to keep their daughters well guarded from all attempts against their virginity, since there is no external sign to show them whether a fault has been committed.

It follows from these explanations that in order to satisfy both text and context of the difficult passage, "almah" must signify a pure virgin—a virgin who is pure, at least, in the opinion of men. And combining this result with the result of our investigation of the other passages in which "almah" occurs, we must conclude that the word commonly means a pure and undefiled virgin.

This conclusion is confirmed by the LXX. version, in which 'almah is four times rendered *νεάνις*, or maid (Ex. ii. 8; Ps. lxvii. (lxviii.) 26; Cant. i. 3; vi. 7), once *νεότης* (Prov. xxx. 19), but in the present passage *παρθένος*, or virgin. There must, then, have been a special reason, be it tradition or the current explanation of the text, which induced those writers to adopt this version. It is not surprising that Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion relinquished the rendering *παρθένος*, because at their time the Christians already began to use the text in their controversial writings (cf. Iren. iii. 24; Justin, Tryph. 71).

2. It must further be noted that 'almah in the Hebrew text has the definite article, and that it is followed by two participles, so that we must render literally: "Behold, the virgin is pregnant, and is bringing forth a son, and his name she shall call Emmanuel." If we then insist on the literal meaning of the prophecy, the virgin, though she is virgin, is pregnant and bringing forth her son, so that she is both virgin and mother. It appears from the following verb that the prophet intended his words to be explained in this literal sense; for he does not say "and she is calling his name Emmanuel," but he continues, "and she shall call his name." The prophecy in its literal meaning has, therefore, not been verified in any one except in the Blessed Virgin, so that she alone is literally spoken of by Isaias. Drach (De l'harmonie entre l'Eglise et la Synagogue, Paris, 1844, t. ii pp. 237 ff.) has shown that it is probably owing to Isaias' prophecy concerning the virgin-mother that virginity has been held in such high esteem among most nations of even pagan antiquity.

δ. The context of this passage too requires that it be applied to the Blessed Virgin in its literal sense. For, according to the context, the

forsaken of the face of her two kings. The Lord shall bring upon thee and upon thy people, and upon the house of thy father, days that have not come since the time of the separation of Ephraim from Juda, with the king of the Assyrians."

#### COROLLARIES.

1. The prophet's predietion that the Messiah will be conceived and born of a virgin who has not known man, that his name will be Emmanuel, and that he will be the Redeemer of his people, is for Christians certain from the text of St. Matthew.

2. Against Rationalists the Messianic character of the prophecy may be proved from the connection of chapters vii., viii., ix., xi., and Mich. v. The unanimous Jewish tradition regarding Is. viii. 8 and Mich. v. 5, and the fact that St. Matthew used the prophecy against the Jews in a Messianic sense without finding any contradiction on the part of his opponents, are as many confirmations of the first argument for the Messianic reference of Is. vii.

The virginal conception and birth of the Emmanuel can be rendered probable to a Rationalist even from Isaias' prophecy: *a.* Because the LXX. rendered the word "almah" by "*παρθένος*;" *b.* because St. Matthew found no difficulty when he saw a fulfilment of this prophecy in Christ's virginal conception; *c.* because it has been the universal tradition among the nations that many of their divine heroes and many of their extraordinary men were born of virgin-mothers.

3. As to the Jews, they could infer the Messianic character of Isaias' prophecy by comparing it with other clearly Messianic predictions. From the latter they knew that

virgin of whom the prophet speaks is the mother of Emmanuel. Now, Emmanuel must from the whole setting of the prediction be literally applied to Jesus Christ. Hence the virgin-mother too must be the Messiah's mother in the literal meaning of the word.

*c.* Nearly all the patristic testimonies to which we referred above, as applying Isaias' prophecy to the Messiah, bear also witness to its literal Messianic application.

the Messiah would free the house of David from its enemies, though they might not believe him so far distant as he really proved to be. It is hardly probable that they should have understood from the words of the prophecy the virginal conception and birth of the Messiah, though they must have perceived that the Messiah's mother would be a most extraordinary virgin, and perhaps even that she must be especially privileged in her conceiving and giving birth to the Messiah. The Alexandrian translators seem to have had a further developed doctrine on the virginity of Emmanuel's mother. And we may reasonably suppose that about the time of Christ's birth the Messianic expectation had attained such a state of perfection that the Evangelist's doctrine was for the new converts nothing else than a clear exposition of what they had known implicitly and obscurely.

## CHAPTER IV.

## THE PRECURSOR OF THE MESSIAS.

## Section I. The Voice in the Desert.

Is. xl. 1-11.

## INTRODUCTION.

**1. CONNECTION OF THE PROPHECY WITH THE PROPHEPIC SERIES OF ISAIAS.**—The prophecy belongs to the second part of Isaias' book, which begins with c. xl. and ends with c. lxvi. It may be called "the Book of Consolation," since the very opening words give us the key-note of the whole second part. It consists of three divisions, each of which embraces nine cantos. The general subject of the single divisions is indicated in xl. 2, according to which chapters xl.-xlviii. evolve the idea, "her evil is come to an end;" chapters xlix.-lvii. inculcate the thought, "her iniquity is forgiven;" chapters lviii.-lxvi., finally, describe how "she hath received of the hand of the Lord double for all her sins." The style of the whole second part is even and majestic, except in liii. and lvi. 9-lvii., where the sadness and the anger which the prophet represents affect his style and conform it to his subject-matter.

The present prophecy belongs to the first of the three divisions, forming part of its Introduction; for the whole Introduction to the first division extends throughout the 40th chapter. A careful reading shows that the Introduction consists of two parts, one of which we may call the general introduction, contained in vv. 1-11; the other may be named the special introduction, extending from

vv. 12-31. It is clear from this that the present prophecy coincides with the general introduction.

**2. THE MESSIANIC CHARACTER OF THE PROPHECY.**—The liberty promised in the prophet's prediction is neither solely temporal nor solely spiritual. The solely Messianic reference of the prophecy is defended by Ephrem, Jerome, Cyril, Eusebius, Thomas, Osorio, Forciro, Pinto, Sasbout, Lapide, Menochius, Gordon, Maldonatus. Tirinus also denies that the prediction in its literal sense refers to the liberation of the Jews from the Babylonian captivity; still he grants that it alludes to this fact. Mariana, Calmet, Neteler, Rohling, Trochon, and Knabenbauer have thought it right to differ with the former authors; for they refer the literal sense of Is. xl. 1-11 to the liberation of the Jews from the Babylonian captivity, while they apply it in its typical sense to the Messianic salvation and to St. John the Baptist.

It is clear from the preceding and the subsequent chapters that the 40th chapter must literally refer to the Jewish liberation from the Babylonian captivity. For such an announcement is naturally expected after chapter xxxix., and in the subsequent chapters the same event is literally described as coming to pass through the instrumentality of Cyrus. At the same time it cannot be denied that the prediction has also a Messianic application: *a.* This is plain from the greatness of the promises in verse 5, "and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh together shall see that the mouth of the Lord hath spoken." *b.* The same truth appears from the New Testament, in which the prediction of Isaias is applied to John the Baptist: "For this is he that was spoken of by Isaias the prophet, saying: A voice of one crying in the desert; prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight his paths" (Matt. iii. 3). Similar testimonies are found in Mark i. 3, 4; Luke iii. 4; John i. 23. *c.* We have seen that in its literal sense the prophecy refers to the Jewish deliverance from the Babylonian captivity. Now this event is com-

monly represented in Sacred Scripture as a type of Messianic salvation (cf. Os. ii. 15; Mich. ii. 12, 13; Jer. xxxi. 21 f.; Ezech. xxxvi. 9; xxxvii. 11 ff.). Consequently, the prediction is Messianic from the very nature of its object.

d. We might add to these arguments the weight of extrinsic authority, but the names of the writers who regard the passage as Messianic, either in its literal or in its typical sense, have been given above.

e. Rabbinic tradition too regards the prophetic passage as Messianic. The Midrash on Gen. i. 21, sect. 100, has it: "If the word of Joseph had such a soothing effect upon the hearts of the tribes, how much greater will be the effect when the Holy One, blessed be he, will come to comfort Jerusalem, as it is said: Be comforted, be comforted, my people. . . ." (Is. xl. 1). The Midrash on Leviticus xli. (i. 1, sect. 1) has a Messianic application of Is. xl. 5: "Rabbi Phinehas spoke, in the name of Rabbi Hoshaya, this parable: A king showed himself to the son of his house in his true likeness; for in this world the Shechinah appears to individuals, but in the future the glory of the Lord will appear, as it is said: And the glory of the Lord shall be revealed. . . ." Yalkut on Ex. xxxii. 6 applies Is. xl. 10 in a Messianic sense: "And on account of the sufferings which Israel suffered will the Holy One, blessed be he, give them a double reward in the days of the Messiah, for it is said: Behold, the Lord God will come. . . ."

**3. THE TROPOLOGICAL SENSE** of the passage is so well known and so frequently used that we need not delay over its explanation (cf. Lap., Cyril, Gordon, Sanchez, etc.).

#### IS. XL. 1-11.

<sup>1</sup> Be comforted, be comforted, my people, saith your God. Speak ye to the heart of Jerusalem, and call to her: for her evil is come

<sup>1</sup> **Be comforted.** The whole passage may be divided into five parts: 1. In vv. 1, 2 the prophet describes the redemption in a negative way; 2. vv. 3, 4, 5 the first herald describes the redemption positively; 3. vv. 6-8 the second herald shows that no created



to an end, her iniquity is forgiven, she hath received of the hand of the Lord double for all her sins.

<sup>2</sup>The voice of one crying in the desert: Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the wilderness the paths of our God.

obstacle can frustrate the promised redemption; 4. v. 9 the third herald supposes God's presence; 5. vv. 10-11 the prophet takes up the strain of the third herald, describing the work of redemption more minutely. "Be comforted" contains the burden of the divine commission intrusted to the prophet. This commission is not given once, and then left to the good-will of the prophet, but God gives it continuously; hence "saith the Lord." These good tidings are to be spoken to the heart of Jerusalem, i.e., according to the scriptural manner of expression, to the sorrowing Jerusalem. Finally, three reasons are assigned why the sorrowing city should be consoled: 1. Her evil, or rather her warfare, is come to an end (cf. Knabenb., in Is. i. 62); 2. her iniquity is forgiven, or better, her ransom has been paid (cf. *ibid.* 61, 62); 3. she hath received of the hand of the Lord double for all her sins. This sentence has been taken in a double sense: *a.* Jerusalem has suffered enough to satisfy the divine justice, so that God's compassion now regards what his justice was forced to inflict on Jerusalem as superabundant. The turning-point from anger to love has come, and the latter will break forth the more intensely the longer it has been pent up (Delitzsch, ii. 134 f.). Some see in the double punishment the double destruction of Jerusalem (Jerome, Euseb., Mald., Est.). *b.* Other interpreters, however, apply the "double" not to the punishment of Jerusalem, which even God's justice could not inflict, but they understand it of double grace which the city is to receive (Pinto, Vatable, Mariana, Sa, Clarius, Sasbont, Lapide, Gesenius, Hitzig, Ewald, Hahn, Knabenbater, Umbreit, Stier, etc.). The exception of Delitzsch, that the tense "she hath received" must be taken of past time, since the parallel tenses "is come to an end" and "is forgiven" are taken of the past, is not sufficient to render this view improbable. For the prophet has seen Jerusalem's future before him, and he here describes it as he has seen it, not determining whether what he announces is still to come or has taken place already.

<sup>2</sup>The voice of one crying. Whether we follow our English and Latin versions, or render with Sanchez, Malvenda, Maldonatus (in Matt. iii. 3): "The voice of one crying: In the desert prepare . . .," in either case the words allude to the oriental custom of preparing the road before an important person who journeys through the country. A herald is sent to inform the people of this duty. The prophet therefore shows that the Lord himself will be the guide of Israel on its return from Babylon, even as he had led the people on the way through the desert when it left the Egyptian captivity. As to the real nature of the road, cf. Is. xli. 18; xliii. 20; lii. 11; lv. 12; lvii. 14; lxii. 10. The nature of the preparation is minutely described in the following words, which contain at the same time the end of the work, "the glory of the Lord shall be revealed." But since in the following chapters a twofold redemption is described, that through

Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low, and the crooked shall become straight, and the rough ways plain. And the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh together shall see that the mouth of the Lord hath spoken.

<sup>3</sup>The voice of one saying: Cry. And I said: What shall I cry? All flesh is grass, and all the glory thereof as the flower of the field. The grass is withered and the flower is fallen, because the spirit of the Lord hath blown upon it. Indeed the people is grass: the grass is withered, and the flower is fallen, but the word of our Lord endureth for ever.

<sup>4</sup>Get thee up upon a high mountain, thou that bringest good tidings to Sion, lift up thy voice with strength, thou that bringest good tidings to Jerusalem; lift it up, fear not. Say to the cities of Juda: Behold your God.

<sup>5</sup>Behold, the Lord God shall come with strength, and his arm Cyrus and that through the Messiah, so the preparation here enjoined must be understood as referring to both. It is clear, therefore, that what literally applies to the desert-roads refers also to the preparation of our hearts for the Messianic blessings. The call itself sounds like the long-drawn trumpet-blast of a herald (cf. xvi. 1).

<sup>3</sup>The voice of one saying: Cry. According to the LXX. and St. Jerome, we continue: "And I said;" according to the Hebrew text, the Syriac and the Chaldee versions, the text continues: "And he said." After the preceding promise of Israel's exaltation the prophet might doubt as to the possibility of such a change in the nation's condition. God therefore sends his second herald to announce three points: *a.* all flesh and all its glory is perishable as the flower of the field; *b.* all flesh and all its glory shall really perish; *c.* but the word of the Lord shall stand for ever. The outward manifestation of God's breath seems to be the wind, and in our case the sirocco, at whose blowing in May the spring flora acquires at once an autumn look.

<sup>4</sup>Get thee up. It is disputed whether Sion is the third herald, or whether Sion is the one to whom the third herald announces the glad tidings. Sion is considered the herald of glad tidings by Osorio, Vatable, Sasbont, Maldonatus, Mariana, Foreiro, Rohling, Trochon, Orelli, Delitzsch, and other authors, while Sanchez, Calmet, Schegg, Gesenius, Knobel, Hahn, Knabenbauer, and others agree with the LXX. and the Targumim, rendering the clause: "preacher of salvation to Jerusalem." According to the former view, Jerusalem is to ascend a high mountain after God has returned to the city, and announce to Sion's daughters, i.e., to the surrounding cities, the gladsome news of the divine deliverance. According to the latter interpretation Sion is looked upon as in the greatest grief, and the herald must console Sion with the glad tidings of God's return to the temple. The herald is expressed by the feminine gender, in order to signify that it applies to all who may come to Jerusalem.

<sup>5</sup>Behold, the Lord God shall come with strength. In the following

shall rule; behold, his reward is with him, and his work is before him. He shall feed his flock like a shepherd, he shall gather together the lambs with his arm, and shall take them up in his bosom, and he himself shall carry them that are with young.

#### COROLLARY.

The Jews could suspect the Messianic character of this prophecy, because they seem to have known the typical character of their return from Babylon. The general description of the Messianic preparation is more minutely described in the prophecy of Malachias.

### Section II. Elias the Prophet.

Mal. iv. 5, 6.

#### INTRODUCTION.

##### 1. CONNECTION OF THE PROPHECY WITH ITS CONTEXT.

The people complain that it is vain to serve God, that he makes no distinction between the evil and the good. The prophet replies that the day is coming when God will own those that are his and silence the murmurers (iii. 13-18). The workers of wickedness will be punished, and the just will triumph over their fall (iv. 1-3). The prophecy concludes with an exhortation to obey the requirements of the Mosaic law, and with a promise of a coming of Elias the prophet to move the people to repentance for the day of the Lord, and thus to avert or mitigate the curse that otherwise must fall upon the earth (iv. 4-6).

**2. MESSIANIC CHARACTER OF THE PROPHECY.**—All grant that the promised Elias will prepare the day of the Lord.

verses the prophet takes up the tidings of the third herald, and especially the words: "Behold your God." God will bring his own work to a successful issue: he will reward the deserving and chastise the wicked. This twofold nature of God's work is described repeatedly in *Isaias*; cf. viii. 21; ix. 1; xxiv. 6, 10; xxx. 23, 27, etc. Finally, *Isaias* returns to a more detailed description of God's mercy, representing him as a faithful and loving shepherd who cares for every want of his flock.

But it is disputed which day of the Lord is meant in the present passage. A number of authors maintain that the first advent of the Messiah is called the day of the Lord in this prophecy. The reasons for this opinion may be reduced to the following: *a.* The angel foretells of John the Baptist: "And he shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elias . . ." (Luke i. 17). Now John the Baptist went before the Lord at his first advent. Besides, when Jesus spoke to the assembled multitude about John the Baptist, he said expressly: "And if ye will receive it, he is Elias that is to come" (Matt. xi. 14). Again, after his transfiguration Jesus testified before his disciples: "But I say to you that Elias is already come, and they knew him not, but have done unto him whatsoever they had a mind" (Matt. xvii. 12). In all these instances, therefore, the arrival of Elias is identified with the coming of John the Baptist before the first advent of the Lord. *b.* Another reason for applying Mal. iv. 4-6 to the first coming of the Lord rests on the identity of Elias, promised in this prophecy, with the angel who is announced in Mal. iii. 1 as coming to prepare the way before the face of the Lord (Reinke, Keil, Pressel, Trochon). Now the latter is clearly predicted as coming before the first advent of the Messiah. *c.* Finally, this opinion is not destitute of external authority. For though among the patristic writers St. Ephrem seems to be the only one to defend it, it has found a number of adherents among the later commentators — Barhebræus, Burgensis, Arias, Clarius (does not apply it to the first advent exclusively), Braun, Bergier, Jahn, Scholz, Ackermann, Dereser, Reinke, and a number of Protestant writers, such as Keil, Pressel, etc. *d.* The fifth verse is in Jewish tradition clearly applied to the forerunner of the Messiah, between whose first and second advent no distinction is made in the doctrine of the Synagogue (cf. Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer, c. 40; Debbarim Rab. 3; Midrash on Cant. i. 1; Talmud and Yalkut, a number of passages).

**3. THE SECOND ADVENT.**—Other commentators maintain that the prophecy refers only to the second advent of Christ, so that the forerunner promised in it will prepare the world for the Lord's second coming. The reasons for this explanation of the passage may be reduced to the following:

*a.* The LXX. render Mal. iv. 5: "Behold, I will send you Elias the Thesbite . . ." Now a forerunner who would come only in the spirit of Elias could not be called "the Thesbite;" hence the LXX. suppose that Elias will return in person. The same Jewish belief is expressed in Matt. xvii. 10: "Why then do the scribes say that Elias must come first?" And, far from contradicting this tradition, Jesus himself rather confirms it, saying: "Elias indeed shall come, and restore all things" (Matt. xvii. 11). The same incident is related in Mark ix. 10 ff. Ecclus. xlviii. 10 (cf. *ibid.* 1-9) testifies to the existence of the same tradition among the Jews, according to which Elias in person is "to appease the wrath of the Lord, to reconcile the heart of the father to the son, and to restore the tribes of Jacob." It is equally evident that Elias in person did not do all this before the first advent of the Messiah. Hence he must do so before the second coming of Christ.

*b.* Another reason for applying the prophecy to the second advent of the Messiah is based on the words of the text itself. Elias the prophet is to come "before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord." But the great and dreadful day of the Lord is the time of his second coming, as is clear from Is. ii. 12; xiii. 6; xxxiv. 8; Lam. i. 12; ii. 22; Joel i. 15; ii. 1; Am. v. 18; Abd. 15; Soph. i. 7, 14; Zach. xiv. 1. According to Joel ii. 31 this day is clearly placed after the outpouring of the Holy Spirit.

*c.* The third reason for applying the prophecy of Mal. iv. 4-6 to the Messiah's second coming is taken from the difference between the precursor promised in this passage and the forerunner who is promised in iii. 1 ff.; this latter is an angel, who is to prepare the way of the Lord, and whom

the Lord will presently follow, coming to his temple and restoring the sanctity of worship and sacrifice; the former, on the contrary, is a prophet, Elias the Thesbite in person, who will bring about the reformation of the people, lest the Lord may on his coming strike the earth with anathema.

*d.* The patristic testimonies in favor of this explanation are most numerous: Tertullian, Hilary, Origen, Victorinus, Justin, Hippolytus, Ambrose, Augustine, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, Gregory the Great, John Damascene, Cyril, Theodoret, etc. (cf. Knabenb., in *Prophet. Min.* ii. p. 490). Among the commentators who adhere to this opinion may be named Ribera, Sanchez, Lapede, Sa, Knabenb., etc. Pusey endeavors to interpret the prophecy as applying to both advents of the Messiah (*Minor Prophets*, ii. 499; New York, 1889). As to the testimony of theologians regarding the meaning of the prophecy, it is too clear to admit of explanation. Bellarmine calls the opinion that Enoch and Elias in person will return "most true," and the opposite opinion he calls heretical or approaching heresy (*Rom. Pont.* iii. 6; *de Controv.*, i. p. 719, Paris, 1608). Suarez maintains that the opinion concerning Elias' coming in person is either of faith or is very nearly so (*in iii. St. Thom.* q. 59, disp. 55, sect. 2; Moguntiae 1604, ii. p. 654). A long list of the writers and interpreters who have defended the explanation of Mal. iv. 4-6 according to which Elias is to come in person, may be found in Natal. Alexander, *Hist. Vet. Testam., in mundi quintam ætatem* dissert. 6 (ed. Paris, 1730, ii. p. 185).

#### MAL. iv. 5, 6.

<sup>1</sup> Remember the law of Moses my servant, which I commanded him in Horeb for all Israel, the precepts and judgments.

<sup>1</sup> Remember the law of Moses. The people had murmured, saying: "He laboreth in vain that serveth God . . ." (iii. 14). The prophet, in concluding his rebuke, insists again on the importance of keeping all the law of Moses, both its ceremonial precepts and its special



Behold, I will send you Elias the prophet, before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord. <sup>2</sup>And he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers, lest I come and strike the earth with anathema.

## COROLLARY.

Though the prophecy of Mal. iv. 4-6 refers properly to the second coming of Christ, still the Jews admitted its Messianic character. At the same time, the Synagogue did not distinguish between the first and second coming of the Messias. Hence they expected, in general, the coming of Elias before that of the Messias. The disciples in Matt. xvii. 10 follow the scribes in this confusion of the two comings of the Messias. Jesus in his answer distinguishes between the two: *a.* Elias, indeed, shall come and restore all things before the second coming of Christ. *b.* But Elias is already come, not in person, but in type, before Christ's first coming; and thus even the traditional expectation of the Jewish nation with regard to the preparation of the Messias' arrival has been fully accomplished, so that they are without excuse.

ordinances concerning right and justice. For it is not Moses that gave this law, but God himself is its author (Gal. iii. 19; Heb. ii. 2), who wishes the law to train the people for the Messianic dispensation even as a schoolmaster trains his pupil. And though the Jews as a nation have been unfaithful to this their divinely appointed calling (Rom. x. 19-21), the gifts of God are without repentance, and the Jews too will finally be brought to the Messianic belief Rom. xi. 12, 15, 25).

- <sup>2</sup> **He shall turn the heart of the fathers.** Explanations: 1. He shall convert the hearts of the fathers together with the children, and the hearts of the children together with the fathers (Cyril, Mariana, Pres-sel, Kimchi, Aben-Ezra). The Hebrew preposition rendered by "to" in our English text may be rendered "with" (cf. Ex. xxxv. 22). 2. He shall restore peace in the families and in the nation at large, reconciling the parents with their children, and the elders with their younger brethren (Rosenmüller, Schegg). 3. He shall bring a universal state of peace and harmony (Loeh). 4. He shall bring about a reconciliation between the Jews and the Gentiles, the former of whom are called fathers by the prophet; the latter are named children (Theodore, Calmer). 5. He shall bring about that Jews and Christians alike, who are now at variance with each other, will adhere to the same faith in Christ (Jerome; cf. Lapide, Reinke).



## PART III.

### *THE INFANCY OF THE MESSIAS.*

---

#### CHAPTER I.

##### ADORATION OF THE MAGI. PS. LXXI. 1-17.

##### INTRODUCTION.

**1. STRUCTURE OF THE PSALM.**—The psalm consists of ten stanzas, each being composed of four verses, containing seven syllables each. It may be divided into three parts: *a.* vv. 1-4 are a prayer for the new king; *b.* vv. 5-11 describe, or rather predict, the universality and the eternity of the new king's power; *c.* vv. 12-17 tell us with what justice and kindness he will rule. *d.* The verses which follow are a mere closing word to the second book of psalms.

**2. AUTHOR OF THE PSALM.**—*a.* Kimchi and other Hebrews have been of opinion that the psalm was written by David, when, a short time before his death, he designated his son Solomon as his successor in his kingdom. Hensler in "Bemerkungen über Stellen in den Psalmen und in der Genesis" has successfully refuted this opinion. *b.* The psalm must have been written by Solomon. *α.* First of all, the title of the psalm shows this. For though the Vulgate renders the title, "A Psalm on Solomon," it must be noted that in the Hebrew text we have the same prepo-

sition which in most instances is rendered in the Vulgate as indicating the authorship. Thus we repeatedly read, "A Psalm of David," which should have been rendered according to the Vulgate's present reading, "A Psalm on David."  $\beta$ . What is clear from the inscription of the psalm is confirmed by its style, which resembles the style of the Book of Proverbs, and necessitates that the authorship of the psalm be ascribed to the writer of Proverbs.  $\gamma$ . Finally, the allusions to distant lands, to an extended and peaceful dominion, and a certain air of calm and cheerful reflection, are characteristic of the son of David.

**3. SUBJECT OF THE PSALM.**—*a*. The psalm consists of prayers or wishes, formed or expressed on the accession of some particular Hebrew king, probably of Solomon (Rosenmüller formerly). *b*. Part of the psalm refers literally to Solomon and typically to Christ; part refers literally to the Messiah (Muis, Bossuet, Patrizi, etc.). Both these views are based principally on a false rendering of the psalm's title. *c*. Here as in psalm xlv. the reigning king (Solomon, Ozias, Josias) is idealized (Cheyne). Or the psalm presents Israel's aspirations for the ideal Messianic king, typified by, but distinct from, the reigning monarch (Briggs, "Messianic Prophecy," pp. 137, 138). *d*. The psalm is wholly Messianic in its literal sense. This view rests on the following arguments: 1. Justin, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Tertullian, Theodoret, and Augustine have explained the psalm in this manner. Their testimonies may be found collected in Reinke's work on the Psalmus, and the references are indicated in Kilber's *Analysis Biblica*, ii. 60. 2. No earthly king could have fulfilled the predictions, and justified the king's description as given in the psalm; to think that any king could have thus spoken of his own term of office is to ascribe to him a boundless vanity and an unbearable pride. It must then be inferred that the psalmist's spirit was under the influence of a power which prompted these utterances in which the Church in all ages has found announcements of the Messiah.

3. This sentiment of the Church regarding Ps. lxxi. fully agrees with the view of the Synagogue. We may be allowed to quote the most remarkable of the pertinent Jewish testimonies:

*Verse 1.* The Targum renders: "O God, give the decrees of thy judgments to the king Messiah, and thy righteousness to the son of David the king." The Midrash refers this to the Messiah with reference to Is. xi. 1, 5 (fol. 27, col. 4).

*Verse 10.* The Midrash on Genesis, or Bereshith Rabba, sect. 78, has the following passage: "One of the common people said to the Rabbi Hoshaya: In case I tell you a nice thing, would you repeat it in the college in my name? What is it? All the presents which our father Jacob gave to Esau the nations of the world will once return to the king Messiah, as it is said: 'The kings of Tharsis. . . .' It is not written 'they shall bring,' but 'they shall return.' Truly, said Rabbi Hoshaya, thou hast said a nice thing, and I will publicly repeat it in thy name."

*Verse 16.* "And there shall be a firmament on the earth, on the tops of mountains" (a handful of corn in the earth upon the top of the mountains). Tanchuma (fol. 79, col. 4) asks: "When will this be?" "In the days of the Messiah" is the answer. The Midrash on Eccles. i. 9 has the following comment: "As the first Redeemer fed the people with manna (cf. Ex. xvi. 4), so too will the last Redeemer send manna down, as it is said: and there shall be. . . ." The Talmudic tract Shabbath (fol. 30, col. 2) has the following reference to Ps. lxxi. 16: "Rabban Gamaliel was sitting one day explaining to his disciples that in the future (i.e., in Messianic times) a woman will give birth every day, for it is said: 'She travails and brings forth at once' (Jer. xxxi. 8). A certain disciple sneeringly said: 'There is no new thing under the sun' (Eccles. i. 9). 'Come,' said the Rabbi, 'and I will show thee something similar even in this world;' and he showed him a hen which laid eggs every day. Again, Gamaliel sat and expounded that in the future world the trees will bear fruit every day, for it is said:

‘And it shall bring forth boughs and bear fruit’ (Ezech. xvii. 23). As the boughs grow every day, so will the fruit grow every day. The same disciple sneeringly said: ‘There is nothing new under the sun.’ ‘Come,’ said the Rabbi, ‘and I will show thee something like it even now, in this age.’ And he directed him to a caper-berry, which bears fruit and leaves at all seasons of the year. Again, as Gamaliel was sitting and expounding to his disciples that the land of Israel in the Messianic age would produce cakes and clothes of the finest wool, for it is said: ‘There shall be a handful of corn in the earth, . . .’ that disciple again sneeringly remarked: ‘There is nothing new under the sun.’”

*Verse 17.* “Let his name be blessed for evermore, his name continueth before the sun.” The Talmud very often applies this verse to the Messiah. In Pesachim (fol. 54, col. 1; cf. Nedarim, fol. 39, col. 2) we read: “Seven things were created before the world. These are: the Law, for it is said: ‘The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his ways, before his works of old’ (Prov. viii. 22); Repentance, for it is said: ‘Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world . . . , thou saidst: Return, ye children of men’ (Ps. xc. 2, 3); the Garden of Eden, for it is said: ‘And the Lord planted the Garden before’ (Gen. ii. 8); Hell, for it is said: ‘For Tophet is ordained of old’ (Is. xxx. 33); the glorious Throne and the Site of the Sanctuary, for it is said: ‘The glorious throne called from the beginning, and the place of our sanctuary’ (Jer. xvii. 12); the Name of the Messiah, for it is said: ‘His name shall endure for ever, before the sun (existed) his name was Yinnon.’”

To show that the Synagogue always regarded Yinnon as the Messiah, we may appeal to the prayers for the Day of Atonement: “Before he created anything, he established his dwelling, and Yinnon the lofty armory he established from the beginning, before any people or language. He counselled to suffer his divine presence to rest there, that



those who err might be guided into the path of rectitude. Though their wickedness be flagrant, yet hath he caused repentance to precede it, when he said: 'Wash ye, cleanse yourselves.' Though he should be exceedingly angry with his people, yet will the Holy One not awaken all his wrath. We have hitherto been cut off through our evil deeds, yet hast thou, O our Rock, not brought consummation on us. The Messiah, our righteousness, is departed from us; horror has seized us, and we have none to justify us. He hath borne the yoke of our iniquities, and our transgression, and is wounded because of our transgression; he beareth our sins on his shoulder, that he may find pardon for our iniquities. We shall be healed by his wound, at the time that the Eternal will create him as a new creature. O bring him up from the circle of the earth, raise him up from Seir, to assemble us a second time on Mount Lebanon, by the hand of Yinnon." A number of other Rabbinic testimonies regarding the Messianic nature of Psalm lxxi. may be seen in Reinke's "*Messianische Psalmen*," ii. pp. 45 f., Giessen, 1858.

PS. LXXI. 1-17.

<sup>1</sup> Give to the king thy judgment, O God,  
And to the king's son thy justice,  
To judge thy people with justice,  
And thy poor with judgment.

<sup>2</sup> Let the mountains receive peace for the people,

<sup>1</sup> **Give to the king.** The parallel terms in the first stanza are: "king" and "king's son," both referring to the Messiah, who is the divinely appointed king, and David's royal son; "judgment" and "justice," constituting together the gift of perfect rule; thy people and thy poor, for the people was really destitute of all supernatural goods, and was entirely given over into the hands of its merciless enemy. The clause "to judge" would be more correctly rendered either "he will judge" or "may he judge."

<sup>2</sup> **Let the mountains.** The parallel terms in the second stanza are: "mountains" and "hills," represented here as bringing forth peace, because they are the most conspicuous parts of the country, or because they are the most sterile part of the land, so that their fertility will excite most admiration, or again, because they are the most

And the hills justice.  
 He shall judge the poor of the people,  
 And he shall save the children of the poor.

• • • • •  
<sup>3</sup> And he shall humble the oppressor,  
 And he shall continue with the sun,  
 And before the moon, throughout all generations.

<sup>4</sup> He shall come down like rain upon the fleece,  
 And as showers, falling gently upon the earth;  
 In his days shall justice spring up,  
 And abundance of peace, till the moon be taken away.

<sup>5</sup> And he shall rule from sea to sea,

representative portion of the land ; mountains and hills signify metaphorically kings and princes ; " peace " and " judgment " are parallel terms, because the poor and the children of the poor will find their peace in obtaining justice ; to judge them justly is to save them.

<sup>3</sup> **And he shall humble.** According to Bickell the first line of this stanza is wanting in the present text. The second line continues the prayer of the preceding stanza in favor of the poor and helpless against the rich and powerful. Instead of rendering " and he shall continue . . . " it would be better to translate: " they shall fear thee with the sun and before the moon . . . , " i.e., the kingdom of the Messiah will endure forever.

<sup>4</sup> **He shall come down.** With this stanza begins a description of the eternity and the universality of the Messianic rule. A simple reading of the text suffices to show us that, according to the present collocation of stanzas, the description of the kingdom's eternity and universality is blended with the description of its justice and mercy. Hence Bickell has transposed vv. 12-15 between vv. 7 and 8 (according to our division, the third and fourth stanza from the end would have to be placed after the third stanza from the beginning). But this manner of transposing the text appears to be too violent a measure to deserve commendation. The rain falling on the cut-off grass, and the showers gently irrigating the earth, present a beautiful picture of the meek and benevolent influence of the Messianic rule. Justice and peace are again identified, and are held out as the result of the Messiah's rule, and like the latter the former will last to the end of the moon, i. e., forever.

<sup>5</sup> **And he shall rule.** The extent of the rule is first described by the limits of the territory ; then by the homage of the subjects. The territory reaches from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth. *a.* These limits are the same as those described in Ex. xxiii. 31 : " And I will set thy bounds from the Red Sea to the sea of the Palestines, and from the desert to the river [Euphrates]." The king will, therefore, according to this explanation, reign over the whole of Palestine, from the Euphrates to the Mediterranean, and from the latter to the Red Sea. *α.* But this explanation does not fit into the context, since in the following clause the kingdom is said to

And from the river unto the ends of the earth;  
Before him the Ethiopians shall fall down,  
And his enemies shall lick the ground.

<sup>6</sup> The kings of Tharsis and the islands shall offer presents,  
The kings of the Arabians and of Saba shall bring gifts,  
And all kings of the earth shall adore him,  
All nations shall serve him.

<sup>7</sup> For he shall deliver the poor from the mighty,  
And the needy that have no helper;  
He shall spare the poor and needy,  
And he shall save the souls of the poor.

He shall redeem their souls from usuries and iniquity,

extend "unto the ends of the earth."  $\beta$ . The king too is represented as superior to all other kings, for "all kings of the earth shall adore him." *b*. Other interpreters have, therefore, expressed the opinion that the psalmist uses the above phrases as they are used by Zacharias (ix, 10): "And his power shall be from sea to sea, and from the rivers even to the end of the earth." Here the Messianic kingdom is described as embracing all the parts of the earth, and the description is couched in nearly the same terms that are used by the psalmist (cf. Ps. ii, 8; Dan. iv, 19). It is hard to determine the exact seas which the prophet and the psalmist refer to; perhaps they are the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean; perhaps the expressions are indefinite, and stand for any two seas whatever, or again they may stand for the seas that surrounded the habitable land according to the ideas of the ancients.

<sup>6</sup> **The kings of Tharsis.** As in the preceding lines the psalmist mentions the uncivilized inhabitants of the dry countries or of the desert, and even the enemies of the king as licking the dust, so does he in the present stanza introduce the nations from the farthest west, from Tartessus in Spain and from the islands together with the most eastern peoples, from Arabia and Saba, as doing homage to the king by means of the presents they offer him. Their gifts and presents are probably looked upon as being brought at regular seasons and stated times, so that they amount to the tribute of subject kings. Tartessus in Spain was celebrated for its silver and other metals; Saba was reputed for its gold and its rich ointments. All this well applies to Solomon, and for this reason have several commentators explained the literal sense of the psalm as referring to Solomon. It seems preferable, for the reasons above given, to apply all this literally to Jesus Christ, though it may be granted that the description is painted in Solomonic colors.

<sup>7</sup> **For he shall deliver the poor.** In this stanza the psalmist assigns the reason why all the kings will become the willing subjects of the Messianic king. It was an especial duty of the king to defend the needy and give justice to the imploring poor, to feed the helpless and save the lives of the unprotected.

<sup>8</sup>And their name shall be honorable in his sight,  
And he shall live, and to him shall be given of the gold of Arabia,  
For him they shall always adore; they shall bless him all the day.

<sup>9</sup>And there shall be a firmament on the earth,  
On the tops of mountains,  
Above Libanus shall the fruit thereof be exalted,  
And they of the city shall flourish like grass of the earth.

<sup>10</sup>Let his name be blessed for evermore,  
His name continueth before the sun.  
And in him shall all the tribes of the earth be blessed,  
All nations shall magnify him.

#### COROLLARY.

It is true that the tenth verse is applied in the Liturgy of the Church to the adoration of the Magi; but it would

<sup>8</sup> **And their name.** According to the Hebrew text we must render : "And costly is their blood in his sight." Hence the king will make every effort to prevent the blood of the poor from being shed needlessly. As to the clause "he shall live" interpretations vary concerning its subject. *a.* Some maintain that the "afflicted" is the subject. The meaning of the whole passage is then the following : "And the poor shall live, and through gratitude he shall give to the king of the gold of Arabia, and pray for him continually, and bless him all the day." The only difficulty in this explanation arises from the fact that the poor is represented as possessing the gold of Arabia; but Hitzig regards the psalm as the work of an age when many of the Jews had enriched themselves by commerce, though they were still looked down upon by the Gentile nations. *b.* Other interpreters are of opinion that the king is the subject of the phrase "and he shall live." This gives us the meaning : "Let the king live forever ! they shall give him of the gold of Arabia, for him they shall always pray, and shall bless him all the day." The exclamation in this interpretation is surely very abrupt. Cheyne, therefore, suggests that the passage may be a quotation from some intercessory prayer for the king.

<sup>9</sup> **And there shall be a firmament.** The Hebrew text reads : "Let there be a handful of corn (sown) on the earth, upon the top of the mountains, its fruit will wave like (the cedars of) Lebanon ; they shall blossom (may they blossom) out of the city like the herb of the earth."

<sup>10</sup> **Let his name be blessed.** The Hebrew text reads : "His name shall be forever ; his name shall continue while shines the sun ; all the nations shall bless themselves by him, and call him happy." These last phrases are evident allusions to the patriarchal blessings.

be wrong to limit its meaning to that event alone. The homage of the Magi formed only the beginning of the fulfilment of the psalm. The prophecy in its adequate meaning has reference to all the Gentiles that are to be converted to Christ.

## CHAPTER II.

## THE SLAUGHTER OF THE HOLY INNOCENTS.

JER. XXXI. 15-26.

## INTRODUCTION.

**1. CONNECTION OF THE PROPHECY WITH ITS CONTEXT.**—Up to chapter xxx. Jeremiah has accomplished the first part of his calling, which is described in i. 10: “Lo I have set thee this day over the nations, and over kingdoms, to root up, and to pull down, and to waste and to destroy.” Though he gives us even in this part of his book glimpses of a brighter future (cf. iii. 14-18; v. 18; xxiii. 3-8), still he does not fully accomplish the second part of his mission, which is “to build and to plant.” Chapters xxx.-xxxiii. are wholly devoted to this easier and more congenial task. They may be conceived as consisting of three parts. The restoration is predicted and described in chapters xxx. and xxxi.; in chapter xxxii. the promise is confirmed by a symbolical action; in chapter xxxiii. finally we find another verbal confirmation of the same prediction.

Since the present prophecy is contained in the first of the above three parts, we may confine our attention to the consideration of chapters xxx. and xxxi. They contain the following divisions: *a.* xxx. 1-3 is the introduction to the whole; *b.* after the general introduction promising freedom and restoration, the prophet describes these gifts in four stanzas, representing the promised blessings under ever varying aspects: xxx. 4-11, the national calamity may resemble the pangs of child-birth, but the Lord will break the yoke of his people, and restore David’s royal rule; xxx.



12-22, though the wounds of the people are incurable by human means, the Lord himself will heal them, restoring the nation and the state, and sending the Messianic king and priest; xxx. 23-xxxi. 14, though the Lord's whirlwind will go forth and exercise its fury against the wicked, God will be mindful of his eternal promises to Israel, the city will be rebuilt, and the land of the covenant will be again the Israelites' possession; xxxi. 15-26, Rachel may now weep over the unhappy lot of her children, but their return is certain; they have already given signs of repentance. *c.* After the fourfold description of Israel's deliverance follow four predictions of future blessings: xxxi. 27-30 the Lord promises a great increase of numbers in the land; xxxi. 31-34, a new covenant is promised to the returning exiles; xxxi. 35-37, the Lord assures his people that his promises are as unfailing as the laws of nature; xxxi. 38-40, an accurate description of the future city limits is given. Our prophecy is then identical with the fourth stanza, which describes the restoration of Israel.

**2. TIME OF THE PROPHECY.**—From xxxii. 2 and xxxiii. 1 it follows that those two chapters belong to the period of the prophet's honorable detention in the "court of the prison." Now this occurred in Sedecias' tenth year, during the second part of the siege, which had been interrupted by a temporary withdrawal of the Chaldeans, who attacked the Egyptian armies that had been sent to rescue Jerusalem. Chapters xxxii. and xxxiii. belong therefore to the year 589 B.C. Since chapters xxx. and xxxi. constitute a continuous whole with the following two chapters, they too must have been uttered about the same time, though from xxx. 2 it is probable that the contents were uttered before they were committed to writing. The words "at that time" of xxxii. 2 furnish another proof that the prophecies were not written till after Jerusalem had fallen into the hands of the Chaldeans.

**3. EXPLANATIONS OF RACHEL'S WEEPING IN RAMA.**—

*a.* The Hebrew word "Rama" must be rendered "on

high," so that we find the right translation in the Vulgate and the English text. *α.* But in the Greek text (excepting A and S) the word has been taken as a proper name. *β.* Besides, there is hardly a satisfactory reason assignable why Rachel should weep "on high;" for the circumstance that from such a place her lamentation could be heard farther, or that she could observe her children going into captivity from such a position is no sufficient reason for the prophet's language.

*b.* Other authors render the word "Rama" as a proper name, maintaining that in Rama is Rachel's tomb, and that she is therefore rightly represented as weeping in Rama. From Gen. xxxv. 19, and from the testimony of travellers, it is clear that Rachel's tomb is near Bethlehem; I. Kings x. 2 is rightly explained by de Hummelauer, Comment., p. 112.

*c.* Rachel is said to weep in Rama because the latter is situated on the limits of the two kingdoms, so that her voice can be heard in both (Keil, Schneedorfer), or because Rama is the Israelite city nearest to Jerusalem, so that Rachel's lamentations over the captivity of the Israelite tribes can be heard by Jehovah residing in Jerusalem (Scholz). The principal reasons on which this opinion rests are reduced to the assumption that Rachel must have wept over the fate of the ten tribes alone (Jerome, Calmet, Trochon), and to the difficulty of finding a more satisfactory solution.

*d.* Rachel weeps in Rama for the reason assigned in Jer. xl. 1: "The word that came. . . ." This and the testimony of Josephus (Antiq. VIII. xii. 3) show that the Jewish captives were reviewed in Rama previously to their being taken to Babylon, and that all such as were unequal to the journey were there put to death. Being the mother of Benjamin, Ephraim, and Manasses, Rachel is regarded as the mother of the twelve tribes, the ruin of which became complete when even the southern kingdom was destroyed, and when its king and nobles were led into captivity

(Ephrem, Sa, Sanchez, Maldonatus, Mariana). That this is the right explanation of the passage may be seen from the context. In xxx. 4 both Juda and Israel are addressed; xxxi. 5, 9 contains promises given to Ephraim, but xxxi. 6, 12 contains promises for Juda; again, the promises made to Ephraim (xxxi. 18, 20) are closely connected with Juda's promises (xxxi. 23, 24). Since then both kingdoms are remembered in the promises, what prevents us from seeing in the lamentation of Rachel her grief over the ruin of both kingdoms?

**4. MESSIANIC CHARACTER OF THE PROPHECY.**—St. Matt. ii. 18 applies the present prophecy concerning Rachel's weeping to the slaughter of the Holy Innocents. In this the Evangelist furnishes us a beautiful commentary on the prophet. According to the literal sense of the latter, Rachel weeps over the ruin of her children's kingdoms, brought on by the Assyrians and the Babylonians. But the true and final ruin of Israel will follow the nation's rejection of the Messias. If then Rachel weeps over the temporary downfall of Juda and Israel, she weeps with much more reason over their lasting destruction. Now the beginning of the Messias' rejection by the Jewish nation is manifested in his first persecution, when his life is sought that he may not become the king of Israel. Hence the Evangelist beautifully shows the true fulfilment of Jeremias' prediction regarding Rachel's lamenting the ruin of the nation, representing it as mingled with the weeping of the mothers whose innocent children are slain in the Messias' first deadly persecution.

JER. XXXI. 15-26.

Thus saith the Lord : A voice was heard on high of lamentation, of mourning and weeping, of Rachel weeping for her children, and refusing to be comforted for them, because they are not. Thus saith the Lord : Let thy voice cease from weeping,

and thy eyes from tears, for<sup>1</sup> there is a reward for thy work, saith the Lord, and they shall return out of the land of the enemy. And there is hope for thy last end, saith the Lord, and the children shall return to their own borders. Hearing I heard Ephraim when he went into captivity : <sup>2</sup> Thou hast chastised me, and I was instructed, as a young bullock unaccustomed to the yoke ; convert me, and I shall be converted, for thou art the Lord my God. For after thou didst convert me, I did penance, and after thou didst show unto me, I struck my thigh. I am confounded and ashamed, because I have born the reproach of my youth. <sup>3</sup> Surely Ephraim is an honorable son to me, surely he is a tender child ; for since I spoke to him I will still remember him. Therefore are my bowels troubled for him ; pitying I will pity him, saith the Lord. <sup>4</sup> Set thee up a watchtower, make to thee bitterness, direct thy heart into the right way, wherein thou hast walked : return,

<sup>1</sup> **There is a reward for thy work.** The reward of the mother's work consists in the goodness and the success of her children. Rachel's work, consisting in her care and anxiety for her offspring, will then be rewarded by Juda's and Israel's return to their land of promise (cf. Malvenda, Mariana, Sa, Calmet, Knabenb.).

<sup>2</sup> **Thou hast chastised me.** The Hebrew text reads : " I heard Ephraim lamenting : Thou hast chastised me, and I was chastised. . . ." Ephraim acknowledges his faults, and prays God for the grace of conversion. Hence Rachel may feel confident that God will have mercy on her offspring. The words "after thou didst convert me I did penance," are more faithfully rendered : "after my falling away I did penance," or "after I was averted from thee I did penance." Ephraim strikes his thigh as a sign of repentance, and he accepts his shame as a satisfaction for his transgressions.

<sup>3</sup> **Surely Ephraim is an honorable son to me.** According to the original text we must render the phrase as a question, "Is Ephraim an honorable son to me? is he a tender child? As often as I speak against him I lovingly remember him." The Lord is represented as being astonished at himself for his exceeding mercy towards Ephraim. For he loves him almost in spite of himself. *a.* The rendering of the Vulgate, "since the time I spoke of him. . . ." gives a satisfactory meaning ; but the Hebrew particle does not signify "since the time," but "as often as." *b.* Those who render : "As often as I speak of him I remember him," do not reflect that God cannot speak of any one without remembering him. *c.* Those, on the contrary, who render "as often as I speak to him in love," i.e., in order to win his love, must consider that Ephraim is here not represented as a virgin, whose love is sought, but as a wayward son.

<sup>4</sup> **Set thee up a watchtower.** The Hebrew text must be rendered : "Set the up signs (to indicate the way), erect unto thee columns (for the same purpose)." Then follows an exhortation to walk back in the way thus marked out. This exhortation changes into an urgent de-

O virgin of Israel, return to these thy cities. How long wilt thou be dissolute in deliciousness, O wandering daughter? for the Lord hath created a new thing upon the earth: <sup>5</sup> A woman shall com-

mand, in the words: "How long wilt thou be dissolute . . .?" This last address shows hesitancy and fickleness of purpose on the part of the person addressed.

<sup>5</sup> **A woman shall compass a man.** Explanations: *a.* A woman shall protect a man (Rosenmüller, Umbreit, Gesenius, Bade). It would be surely a new thing if a weak and timid woman were to protect a strong and courageous man. *α.* But this is, in the first place, a rather ludicrous motive to propose to the men of Israel in order to move them to return. *β.* Again, in peace, such a defence is useless; in war, such a protection is not desirable.

*b.* Another explanation contends that the passage means: a woman shall seek a man. But not to mention the difficulty of drawing this meaning out of the Hebrew text, Is. iv. 1 assigns this reversed order of the sexual seeking as a sign of the greatest calamity.

*c.* Ewald has proposed the rendering: a woman shall change into a man, i.e., by God's assistance even the woman shall attain the strength and the courage of a man. But this interpretation, too, differs from the meaning of the Hebrew text.

*d.* Sanchez, Tirinus, Calmet, Keil, Cheyne, Nägelsbach, and others interpret the woman as designating the Synagogue or Israel, and the man as signifying God. The meaning of the whole clause is, therefore, that God will again dwell in the midst of Israel, that Israel will convert itself wholly to its God, or that Israel will again adhere to God with all the fervor of its former love. *α.* But the Hebrew text hardly admits of such a meaning; *β.* there is no special reason for understanding by the woman Israel or the Synagogue; *γ.* and finally, according to this interpretation the meaning of the whole passage would be tautological: Israel shall return to its God, for Israel shall love its God.

*e.* Orelli's interpretation: the Church of God will protect the earth with its robust and valiant men, must be rejected for the same reasons which we urged against the last opinion.

*f.* Jerome, Thomas, Vatable, Maldonatus, Sanchez, Sa, Mariana, Lapede, Estius, Menochius, Tirinus, Malvenda, Gordon, Loch, Mayer, Scholz, Trochon, Knabenbauer, and many others have, therefore, adopted the interpretation "a woman, i.e., the Blessed Virgin, shall compass a man, i.e., the Word Incarnate." This interpretation must be adopted for the following reasons: 1. It fits accurately into the context. 2. It satisfies the two conditions that must be verified regarding this text; it must be verified in the Messianic time, as the preceding stanzas too end with the hope of the Messianic time (xxx. 9; 21; xxxi. 11 ff.), and it must agree with the existing Messianic predictions, since Jeremias often repeats previous Messianic promises in order to impress them on the mind and heart of his people (cf. Is. vii. 14; ix. 6; Mich. v. 3). 3. *α.* As to the exception that the Hebrew term here used does not mean "virgin," there is no need of expressly calling the Messiah's mother virgin every time she is referred to. *β.* As to the absence of the definite article before the noun "woman,"

pass a man. Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel : As yet shall they say this word in <sup>6</sup> the land of Juda, and in the cities thereof, when I shall bring back their captivity : The Lord bless thee, the beauty of justice, the holy mountain. And Juda and all his cities shall dwell therein together, the husbandman and they that drive the flocks. For I have inebriated the weary soul, and I have filled every hungry soul. Upon this I was as it were awaked out of sleep, and I saw, and my sleep was sweet to me.

#### COROLLARIES.

1. It follows from what has been said that Jeremias' prophecy in its literal sense does not refer to the slaughter of the Holy Innocents. But, on the other hand, it cannot be said that the prophet's words can be understood of the Holy Innocents only by way of accommodation. For as we have seen, Rachel weeps over the destruction of her people, brought about by the Assyrian and the Babylonian captivities. Now this ruin was only a type of the future ruin that was to follow Israel's rejection of its Messias. The latter ruin began, therefore, with the slaughter of the Holy Innocents, since with this began the outward rejection of the Messias. Rachel, therefore, is really weeping and wailing over the fate of her people in the lamentations of the Bethlehemite women.

this construction occurs also in other passages where a definite person is spoken of (cf. Ewald, *Lehrbuch*, sect. 277 *b.c.*).  $\gamma$ . The Greek Fathers do not unanimously follow this explanation, because they commonly adhere to the rendering of the LXX. version, which reads : "men shall go about in safety." Still, St. Athanasius twice appeals to the rendering of Aquila, "God has created a new thing in woman," and explains the text of the Incarnation.

<sup>6</sup> **In the land of Juda.** Since there has been question of the Messias in the preceding sentence, the transition to the land of Juda, whose king the Messias is, offers nothing surprising. The address : "The Lord bless thee, O beauty of justice, O holy mountain," indicates the principal features of the Messianic effects in Jerusalem. Juda with its cities, the husbandman and the shepherd shall again live in the promised land, God having given abundance to all the hungry and the weary. After this the prophet (not Jehovah, nor Juda) awakes from his sleep, i.e., his state of prophetic ecstasy, and rejoices in the gladsome promises he had received.



2. Since the words, "a woman shall compass a man," refer to the Blessed Virgin's conception of the Word Incarnate, and since the same are said to describe "a new thing upon the earth," it follows that the Word's conception will be brought about in an extraordinary manner. Isaias predicted that the mother would be a virgin; Micheas too calls the Messiah's mother a virgin, but Jeremias describes her conceiving as miraculous. The meaning of these predictions was not fully determined till the angel said to Mary: "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee" (Luke i. 35).

## CHAPTER III.

## THE FLIGHT INTO EGYPT. Os. xi. 1-7.

## INTRODUCTION.

**1. CONNECTION OF THE PROPHECY WITH ITS CONTEXT.—**

The prophet, beginning with ix. 10 and continuing to xiv. 10, has two main points in view: *a.* He describes what God has done for his people, and what the people has done for God. *b.* He depicts the future Messianic salvation. In the first part of c. xi., where our prophecy is found, the sacred writer calls special attention to the following contrasts: *a.* God has led his people out of Egypt, and has instructed it by means of his prophets, but the people has adhered to its idols. *b.* God has guarded the people by a special providence, but the people has most ungratefully ignored God. *c.* God has shown his loving assistance in all his people's difficulties and trials; but now it shall be given over to the sword and to exile, and its punishment shall not be averted, because it is impenitent.

**2. MESSIANIC CHARACTER OF THE PROPHECY.—***a.* The words "I called my son out of Egypt" refer in their literal sense to God's freeing the Israelites out of the Egyptian bondage. *α.* This is evident from the whole context of the passage, *β.* and is well illustrated by the words of Ex. iv. 22 and xix. 5, 6, where Israel is called God's first-born, and God's priestly and royal race. *γ.* The same may be inferred from the LXX. rendering, "my sons," which applies to the whole Israelite nation, and from the Chaldee paraphrase, which gives a similar translation. Still

Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion follow the Hebrew text, retaining its singular number.

*b.* St. Matthew (ii. 15), speaking of our Lord's stay in Egypt, says: "And he was there until the death of Herod, that it might be fulfilled which the Lord spoke by the prophet, saying out of Egypt have I called my son." There can then be no doubt that the prophet's words were in some real sense fulfilled by the return of the child Jesus from Egypt. This is not hard to understand, if we reflect that Israel's adoption to the sonship of God was only a figure of the Messias' real sonship; Israel's call from Egypt is therefore rightly regarded as prefiguring the Messias' recall from the land of exile.

#### OS. XI. 1-7.

Because<sup>1</sup> Israel was a child, and I loved him, and I called my son out of Egypt. As they called them that went away from before their face, they offered victims to Baalim, and sacrificed to idols. And I was like a foster-father to Ephraim, I carried them in my arms, and they knew not that I healed them. I will draw them with the cords of Adam, with the bonds of love, and I will

<sup>1</sup> **Because Israel was a child.** The Hebrew conjunction rendered "because" has both a causal and a temporal meaning (when). The latter interpretation is preferred by Jerome, the Syriac version, Sa, Mariana, Tirinus; but the LXX., Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion adhere to the causal meaning of the conjunction. God, therefore, says: Even when Israel was a child I loved him on account of his very helplessness and called him out of the Egyptian captivity from which he could not have been freed by any natural means. But as my prophets, one and all, spoke to the nation, it turned away its face from them, and adhered to its idols. I behaved towards Ephraim like a nurse, taking them as one takes a child over his arms, but Ephraim did not know me. I drew Ephraim with the bonds of human love and affection, and I behaved to them as a merciful husbandman treats his ox, freeing him at stated intervals from his galling yoke, and I procured even his food for him. But the severity of the punishment will be in keeping with the greatness of the offence; the Egyptian bondage may have been extremely irksome, Ephraim's bondage will be more cruel yet; the king of Assyria will invade the land, his sword shall whirl down upon the cities and the strong places, and the inhabitants shall be led away without hope of ever returning.

be to them as one that taketh off the yoke on their jaws, and I put his meat to him that he might eat. He shall not return into the land of Egypt, but the Assyrian shall be his king, because they would not be converted. The sword hath begun in his cities, and it shall consume his chosen men, and shall devour their heads. And my people shall long for my return, but a yoke shall be put upon them together, which shall not be taken off.

#### COROLLARY.

According to Pusey, St. Matthew does not appeal to this prophecy in order to prove anything, but only for the sake of pointing out the relation of God's former dealings with the people. The ulterior object of the evangelist is therefore nothing else than to remove the prejudice that might arise in the mind of a high-caste Jew from the circumstance that the early infancy of Jesus was passed in a polluted, heathen land. St. Matthew's argument proceeds, therefore, in this way: Your fathers have lived in the land of the unbeliever and the Gentile. But this fact has been no obstacle to God's love for your nation. Therefore Jesus' life in Egypt cannot be considered an obstacle to his divine mission and his divine character. It has been shown that St. Matthew had a far better reason for appealing to Osee's prediction concerning Ephraim, and that therefore the object mentioned by Pusey cannot be said to be the evangelist's sole motive for quoting the prophet.

## PART IV.

### *THE MESSIANIC NAMES.*

---

#### CHAPTER I.

THE MESSIAS IS THE ORIENT. ZACH. III.; VI. 9-15.

#### INTRODUCTION.

**1. CONNECTION OF THE PROPHECIES WITH THEIR CONTEXT.**—The Book of Zacharias is divided into three parts: the first contains a short introduction, and then proposes eight visions (i. 1-vi. 8); the second teaches the people how to prepare for the Messianic benefits that have been promised (vii., viii.). In the third part the burden of the Lord against Hadrach and Israel is described (chapters ix.-xi.; xii.-xiv.). Our two prophecies belong to the first part: Chapter i. 7-17 contains a vision of the divine chariots and horses, which are the Lord's messengers upon earth; i. 18-21 represents four horns, symbolizing the nations hostile to Israel; ii. shows the dimensions of the new Jerusalem under the image of an angel going out with his measuring-line to lay out the site of the new city; iii. Josue or Jesus, the highpriest, stands before the Lord, laden with the sins of the people; iv. a golden candlestick and two olive-trees represent the restored community; v. 1-4, a roll inscribed with curses flies over the land, as a sign that in future the curse for crime will of itself light upon the criminal; v. 5-11, Israel's guilt, personified by a woman, is cast into an ephah-measure, covered by its heavy lid, and

transported to Babylon; vi. 1-8, four chariots, with variously colored horses, appear in order to execute judgment in the different quarters of the earth. Chapter vi. 9-15 forms an historical appendix.

As to the time of these prophecies, Zacharias lived and prophesied in the second and fourth years of Darius Hystaspis (i. 1, 7; vii. 1). Hence we must refer the book to the years 520 and 518 B.C. The eighth month of the second year of Darius falls between the date of Agg. ii. 1-9 and Agg. ii. 10-19. Zach. i. 7-vi. 8 belongs to the twenty-fourth day of the eleventh month of the same year, while chapters vii., viii. are ascribed to the fourth day of the ninth month of the fourth year of Darius.

Returning to the third chapter, we may divide it into two parts: vv. 1-5, the highpriest appears laden with the sins of the people and is accused by Satan, but acquitted and given rule over the temple, with the right of priestly access to the Lord; vv. 6-10, the divine protection, the coming of the Messiah, the restoration of the theocracy, and abundance of peace are promised. In the second prophecy, vi. 9-15, the prophet is commanded to take of the gold and silver which some of the exiles had sent as offerings for the temple, and to make therewith crowns for the highpriest. At the same time, the prophet repeats the promise of the Messiah, who will rule successfully, and complete the building of the temple.

**2. MESSIANIC CHARACTER OF THE PROPHECIES.**—The Messianic bearing of both prophecies may be proved from the name *Orient*, which is given to the promised deliverer and restorer. "I will bring my servant the *Orient*," the prophet says, iii. 8; and vi. 12, "behold a man, the *Orient* is his name." Now it must be noted that in both places the Hebrew text reads "*tsemach*," or "*bnd*," instead of *Orient*. But the name "*bnd*" is peculiar to the Messiah. Hence the above passages refer to the Messiah. As to the statement that "*bnd*" signifies the Messiah in the language of the Old Testament prophets, numerous instances show its undeni-



able truthfulness. Is. iv. 2 reads: "In that day the bud of the Lord shall be in magnificence;" Jer. xxiii. 5 has a similar promise: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, and I will raise up to David a just branch (tsemach)." Again, in xxxiii. 15 the divine promise is worded similarly: "In those days, and at that time, I will make the bud of justice to spring forth unto David." A similar argument might be drawn from the Hebrew text of II. Kings xxxii. 2-5. But the passages quoted sufficiently show that the prophets designate the Messiah by "bud" or "bud of the Lord."

Besides, in Zach. iii. 8 the "bud" is called "my servant." But "servant" is another Messianic title. Hence in this passage the "bud," or the Orient, as it is rendered in our version, designates the Messiah. To complete the inferential value of this argument, we have only to show that in prophetic language "servant" is a name of the Messiah. Since this will be clearly demonstrated in the fifth chapter of this treatise, we need not weary the reader by an anticipation of the proof.

But it may be asked how the name Orient can have been received into our versions instead of the original "bud." It appears that this exchange of names is due to a misunderstanding of the Greek word ἀνατολή, by which the LXX. rendered the Hebrew "tsemach" (צֶמַח). Jerome (in vi. 12) undoubtedly considers the Greek ἀνατολή as derived from ἀνατέλλειν, which is used of the rising sun or moon, but also of growing plants. The LXX. must have introduced the word into their version in this latter meaning. But subsequent translators took the ἀνατολή of the LXX. in its more common acceptance, as signifying the rising of the sun or the moon, and hence also the region in which that phenomenon takes place, i.e., the east. Following the analogy of this reasoning, Ribera maintains that even the Orient of Luke i. 78 must be taken in the sense of "bud," or "plant." Zachary, the author tells us, ascribes to this growing-up plant the power "to enlighten them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death," because

this plant alone is "the true light which enlighteneth every man that cometh into this world." The father of the Baptist, therefore, did not think of the figure of the rising sun when he spoke about the light issuing from the Orient. The LXX. rendering of Ezech. xvi. 7; xvii. 10; Gen. xix. 25; Is. lxi. 11 confirms this interpretation of "tsemach" (צֶמַח). For in the former two passages the Hebrew term is rendered ἀνατολή with such additional determinations as to render the reference of the Greek word to the growing plant undeniably evident. In the passage of Gen. the LXX. employ the plural participle, so that they evidently think of "buds" or "plants," while in the passage of Isaias they render the Hebrew term by "flower." Still, these reasons do not remove all doubt; in Syriac the word "tsemach" (צֶמַח) is applied to the rising sun, so that the Syriac version interprets "tsemach" in Zach. iii. as "radiance," or "brightness." It is, therefore, possible that the LXX. too may have understood the passage in the same manner, especially since they interpret "tsemach" in Is. iv. 2 as applying to the giving forth of light.

Finally, we must draw attention to the circumstance that the Targum too applies these prophetic passages to the Messiah. Zach. iii. 8 is rendered: "Behold, I bring my servant the Messiah, who shall be revealed." And the same Targum renders Zach. vi. 12: "And thou shalt speak to him, saying: Thus speaketh the Lord of hosts, saying, Behold, the man, Messiah is his name, who shall hereafter be revealed and anointed." A great number of Rabbinic testimonies showing that "branch," or "bud," is a Messianic name have been quoted in the explanation of Jer. xxiii. 6 in part I. chap. vi. sect. 2. But even the Rationalists generally grant that "branch," or "bud," is a Messianic title in the prophetic writings of the Hebrews.

It may, however, be asked whether the prophecies refer to the Messiah in their literal sense, or only in their typical meaning. Most writers hold the former opinion; still, St. Ephrem, Theodoret, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Bar-

hebræus interpret the "branch," or "bud," in its literal sense as referring to Zorobabel, while Eusebius refers the literal meaning of the word to Jesus the highpriest; Calmet among the more recent writers has applied the literal sense to Zorobabel or Nehemias. But all these interpreters agree in applying the typical sense of the prophecies to the Messias.

## ZACH. III.

<sup>1</sup> And the Lord showed me Jesus the highpriest standing before the angel of the Lord, and Satan stood on his right hand to be his adversary. And the Lord said to Satan: The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan, and the Lord that chose Jerusalem rebuke thee; is not

<sup>1</sup> And the Lord showed me Jesus. It appears from Is. xxviii. 7; Jer ii 8; v. 31; vi. 13; viii 10, etc.; Os. v. 1; Mich. iii. 11; Soph. iii. 4, etc., that the corruption of the Jewish priesthood had been the chief cause of the national ruin of the people. Since the prophet, after describing the downfall of Israel's enemies, comes to predict its restoration, he naturally dwells upon the renewed priesthood, because a restoration of the latter implies the national re-establishment. Hence, the highpriest, or the representative of the priesthood, stands before the angel of the Lord, the guardian angel of the Hebrew nation. Satan, always intent on impeding the work of the priesthood, stands at the highpriest's right hand. The angel, who is identified by several commentators with St. Michael (cf. Rib., Lap.), addresses Satan in words of indignation: "The Lord rebuke thee." To show his earnestness, he repeats his prayer in almost the same words, only adding the reasons why the Lord should restrain the devil: 1. The Lord himself has chosen Jerusalem for the place of his special habitation, and this divine choice should not be allowed to become frustrated; 2. the people is as a brand plucked out of the fire, having suffered sufficiently for its former transgression. The priesthood having brought about this national ruin, Jesus is properly attired in filthy garments. The latter are removed by the attending angels at the bidding of their superior, the guardian angel of Israel, who explains to the highpriest the symbolical meaning of the clean attire: "Behold, I have taken away thy iniquity and have clothed thee with change of garments." Finally, even the mitre is restored to the highpriest, as in Ezech. xxi. 26 it is taken away from him as a sign of his rejection. This head-dress is according to the Hebrew text rather the royal diadem than the priestly mitre alone. For after the restoration of the theocracy the highpriest will have to exercise a great deal of civil authority. Interpreters, however, generally render the Hebrew word by "mitre." Another difference between the Hebrew text and the common versions deserves notice: according to the former it is the prophet who commands the mitre to be replaced, while according to the latter the angel himself gives this order. The context demands that the angel should be the speaker, since the prophet can

this a brand plucked out of the fire? And Jesus was clothed with filthy garments, and he stood before the face of the angel. Who answered and said to them that stood before him, saying: Take away the filthy garments from him. And he said to him: Behold, I have taken away thy iniquity, and have clothed thee with change of garments. And he said: Put a clean mitre upon his head. And they put a clean mitre upon his head and clothed him with garments, and the angel of the Lord stood. And the angel of the Lord protested to Jesus, saying: Thus saith the Lord of hosts: If thou wilt walk in my ways, and keep my charge, thou also shalt judge my house, and shalt keep my courts, and I<sup>2</sup> will give thee some of them that are now present here to walk with thee. Hear, O Jesus, thou highpriest, thou and thy friends, that dwell before thee, for they are<sup>3</sup> portending men; for behold, I will bring my servant the Orient. For<sup>4</sup> behold, the

hardly be conceived as commanding the angels. The LXX. version omits the clause which determines the speaker, so that the omission itself indicates the angel as the speaker; the Chaldee version has the first person like the present Hebrew text.

<sup>2</sup> **Will give thee some of them.** Since the restoration of the priesthood forms the principal part of the restoration of the theocracy, it is described more minutely in the following verses: *a.* its demands and duties are stated; *b.* its typical significance is indicated; *c.* its final point of perfection is described. As to the passage "I will give thee some . . ." commentators differ in their explanations: 1. "I will give thee guardians out of the number of the angels who are now present here" (Jerome, Cyril, Ribera, Sanchez, Lapipe, Mariana, Menochius, Calmet, Schegg, Lyranus, Tirinus, Hengstenberg, etc.). The angels will therefore assist the priest in the discharge of his onerous and most important duties, in the administration of the temple, and the right direction of the Jewish community symbolically represented by the temple. 2. "I will give thee places to walk or walks among these that stand by, i.e., after thy death thou shalt walk among the angels" (cf. Chald., Trochon, Mariana, Houbigant, Keil). 3. "I will give thee a place of access among these that stand by, thou shalt have an easy way of communing with God and the angels" (Revised Version). 4. "I will give thee guides among them that are now present here;" this rendering is unknown among the ancients. 5. "I will place thy offspring among them that are present here" (Theodotus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, etc.). The first of these interpretations is the most probable in itself, and is supported by the best authority (besides the above authors, LXX., Syriac, Chal.).

<sup>3</sup> **They are portending men.** For men of type are they, or men of forecast are they. The priests' intercessory office makes them types of the great intercessor; or those men can look onward and find in these present dispensations of deliverance and restoration a type of the redemption which will come to us through the "Branch" or the "Bud."

<sup>4</sup> **Behold the stone that I have laid before Jesus.** Explanations:

stone that I have laid before Jesus,<sup>5</sup> upon one stone there are seven eyes. Behold, I will grave the graving thereof, saith the Lord of hosts, and I will take away the iniquity of that land in one day. In that day, saith the Lord of hosts, every man shall call his friend under the vine and under the figtree.

1. The stone is the Messiah (Jerome, Lyranus, Tirinus, Pusey, etc.). But this explanation does not well fit into the context, according to it the passage reads: "I will bring my servant the Orient, for behold the stone (the Messiah) that I have laid before Jesus . . ." The phrases that follow are equally against interpreting the "stone" as the Messiah. 2. The foundation-stone of the temple is meant (Neumann, Henderson, Wright). But this view is untenable, because the foundation of the temple had been laid before Zacharias uttered the prophecy. 3. Nor can it be said that the prophet speaks of the key stone of the temple, or about a particular precious stone on the attire of the highpriest. For there is nowhere any ground for as-signing such a special importance to either of these stones. 4. It remains then that we must adhere to the view that considers the stone as representing the Jewish theocracy (Schegg, Reinke, Trochon, Knabenbauer, Keil, Chambers, etc.). The whole context seems to demand such an explanation, the circumstance that in other passages the Messiah is indicated by the stone does not oppose our interpretation, since the same object may serve as the symbol of several persons or mysteries. And, what is more, the theocracy may be called the Messiah in the same manner in which we now say that the Church is Christ or his mystical body (cf. Ps. cxvii. 22; I. Pet. ii. 7, etc.).

<sup>5</sup> Upon one stone there are seven eyes. Explanations. 1. There appeared seven eyes engraven upon the stone before the highpriest. But iv. 10 supposes that the eyes are to be there in the future. 2. The seven eyes represent the divine providence, or the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost (cf. Apoc. v. 6, Is. xi. 2 ff.). The number seven indicates the perfection and the completeness of the providential care and of the spiritual gifts (Theodotion, Sanchez, Menochius, Trochon, etc.). But this explanation does not fit as well into the context as it should, nor is the parallelism with the passage in the Apocalypse fully to the point. 3. According to others the passage alludes to the manners and customs of the Persians, who call the seven highest ministers of state the eyes of the king (cf. Suidas, Hesychius, Tirinus, Calmet, Reinke). If it be added that in iv. 10 the seven eyes of the Lord are said to run to and fro through the whole earth, and that in Apoc. v. 6 the seven spirits of the Lord are represented as sent out into the whole earth, it appears probable that in the prophecy too the seven eyes symbolize the seven angels who stand before the Lord (Knabenbauer, cf. Ribera, Lapide, Calmet, Trochon). The seven angels are, therefore, watching over the development of the Synagogue, the care of which has been given to Jesus, and in him to the priesthood. It may be added that those who see a symbol of the Messiah in the stone interpret the words "I will grave the graving thereof" as referring to the passion and death of Christ. This can, however, be done only by way of accommodation.



## ZACH. VI. 9-15.

And the word of the Lord came to me, saying: Take<sup>a</sup> of them of the Captivity, of Holdai, and of Tobias, and of Idaias; and thou shalt come in that day, and shalt go into the house of Josias, the son of Sophonias, who came out of Babylon. And thou shalt take gold and silver, and shalt make crowns, and thou shalt set them on the head of Jesus the son of Josedec the highpriest, and thou shalt speak to him, saying: Thus saith the Lord of hosts, saying: <sup>1</sup> Behold a man, the Orient is his name, and

<sup>6</sup> **Take of them of the Captivity.** God wishes to show how acceptable are the Israelite offerings for the benefit of the temple. Hence they are set in the very crown of the highpriest. The text speaks about crowns in the plural or dual, not about a single crown. *a.* Some have supposed that the highpriest was to wear two crowns; *b.* others have suggested that the crowns were to represent the royal and the priestly dignities, but it seems that this union would be more fitly symbolized by two crowns joined into one after the manner of a tiara; *c.* others again are of opinion that the plural is used in this passage for the sole purpose of indicating the magnificence of the crown; but this last view appears to have no better foundation than the Chaldee version.

<sup>1</sup> **Behold a man, the Orient is his name.** After placing the crowns on the head of the highpriest the prophet is warned to address Jesus, reminding him of the antitype of whom he and his followers are only a sign. For it has been shown above that the Orient is a proper name of the Messiah. Then various details concerning the Messiah are added: 1. Under him shall he spring up, i.e., under him shall spring up a multitude of faithful believers (Jerome, Ribera, Lapede, Pressel Cyril), or he shall be born in a lowly condition, and acquire the full dignity which belongs to the Messiah little by little (Reinke, Knabenbauer, etc.). This latter interpretation appears to be the more probable one, since the Orient is the subject in the preceding and in the following clause. 2. He shall build a temple to the Lord, yea, he shall build a temple to the Lord. The prophet shows by repeating this second prediction of the Messiah how important the temple, the real temple, or the Church, is in the sight of God. The highpriest is therefore implicitly warned to erect the typical temple with all care and solicitude (cf. Dan. ix. 24; 1. Cor. iii. 9). 3. He shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne. After the erection of the real temple, after the institution of the Church, the Messiah shall be glorified, and he shall occupy the throne which is his in a most peculiar way (11 Kings vii. 16; Ps. lxxxviii. 38; Ezech. xxi. 26, 27; xvi., xvii. 22, 24; Luke i. 32). 4. He shall be a priest upon his throne, and the counsel of peace shall be between them both. It may be asked who are the two between whom there shall be peace. Answers: *a.* There shall be peace between Zorobabel and Jesus the highpriest. This is the explanation of those who see in the passage



under him shall he spring up, and shall build a temple to the Lord. Yea, he shall build a temple to the Lord, and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a priest upon his throne, and the counsel of peace shall be between them both. And<sup>s</sup> the crowns shall be to Helem, and Tobias, and Idaias, and to Hem, the son of Sophonias, a memorial in the temple of the Lord. And they that are far off shall come, and shall build in the temple of the Lord, and you shall know that the Lord of hosts sent me to you. But this shall come to pass, if hearing you will hear the voice of the Lord your God.

#### COROLLARY.

The chief consolation which the contemporaries of the prophet might draw from these predictions was a divine assurance that the temple would surely be restored, and that another great offspring of David's or Zorobabel's family would rule in it.

a literal reference to Zorobabel. *b.* There shall be peace between the royal and the sacerdotal dignities (Ribera, Sanchez, Lapide, Menochius, Tirinus, Gordon, and common). But this explanation impresses one as being far-fetched. *c.* There shall be peace between the Jews and the Gentiles (Sa). This interpretation gives a very satisfactory meaning to the passage, but neither Jews nor Gentiles are mentioned in the context. *d.* There shall be peace between the Jews who have returned to the promised land and the Jews who have remained in Babylon (Schegg). But the context has nothing about such a division of the Jewish community. *e.* There shall be peace between the Messiah and Jesus, between the type and the antitype (Knabenbauer). According to this view the highpriest is admonished to fulfil the duties of his office in a manner fully conformable with the perfection of the Messianic priesthood. This explanation too is open to several exceptions.

<sup>s</sup> **And the crowns shall be.** The prophet concludes by securing a perpetual memorial to the liberality of Helem, Tobias, and Idaias, who had brought the Babylonian contributions for the erection of the temple (cf. verse 10), and to the hospitality of Josias, the son of Sophonias, in whose house the Babylonian envoys had found shelter. For what is rendered "to Hem, the son of Sophonias," must according to the Hebrew text be translated "to the kindness of the son of Sophonias." The memorial consists in keeping the crowns in the temple treasury, or according to the Talmudic tradition, in the window of the temple porch. Induced by this manifestation of the divine favor, many of those who have been led far away into captivity shall come and offer gifts for the building of the temple (cf. Rom. i. 5; xvi. 19, 26; Eph. ii. 13). We may infer from the typical sense of the priesthood that the conversion of the Gentiles too is here predicted.

## CHAPTER II.

## THE MESSIAS IS THE SON OF MAN. DAN. VII.

## INTRODUCTION.

**1. DIVISION OF THE PROPHECY.**—The chapter consists of two parts, a vision of Daniel (vv. 1–15) and its explanation (vv. 16–28). The vision is of four beasts emerging from the sea: a lion with eagle's wings, a bear, a leopard with four wings and four heads, and a fourth beast with powerful iron teeth, destroying all things, and with ten horns, among which another little horn springs up, speaking proud things, before which three of the other horns are rooted out (vv. 1–8). The second part of the vision is of a celestial assize: the Almighty, represented as an aged man, is seated on a throne of flame and surrounded by myriads of attendants; the fourth beast is slain; one like unto a son of man comes in the clouds of heaven into the presence of the Almighty, and receives from him a universal and never-ending dominion (vv. 9–15). The second part of the chapter explains the vision: the four beasts signify four kingdoms; the fourth will be more powerful and formidable than the first three, but will be split up into ten kingdoms, and finally an eleventh will arise waging fearful war against the men and the kingdom of God, till it shall be destroyed by the power of the Most High. Then the people of the saints of the Most High will receive dominion over the entire earth.

**2. THE TIME OF THE PROPHECY** is indicated in the text; it is given in the first year of Belshazzar (Baltassar). But there is the greatest difficulty with regard to the question of Belshazzar's identity. He is named king in Dan. viii. 1;

king of Babylon in vii. 1; king of the Chaldees in v. 30. In the second of these passages Daniel speaks of Belshazzar's first year; in the first passage of his third year. We find a king of a similar name mentioned in Bar. i. 11, 12. But outside of these passages there occurs no Babylonian king of this name in either inspired or profane sources. Hence the most diverse opinions as to Belshazzar's identity have been advanced and defended:

*a.* Belshazzar is identical with Naboned, the last Babylonian king before the city's capture by Cyrus (Flavius Josephus, Jerome, Hengstenberg, Auberlen, Havély). Reasons: *α.* Dan. v. 30, 31 (Heb. v. 30; vi. 1); *β.* besides his official name Nabunahid, the last king of Babylon might have a family name like that of his son Bel-sar-ussur, by which he might be known to the Jews. *γ.* The Assyrian inscriptions speak of Nabunahid's son under the name Bel-sar-ussur.

*b.* Belshazzar is identical with Laborosoarchod, or Labosardoeh, as Josephus writes the name (Sealiger, Calvinus, Pererius, Maldonatus, Ebrard, Delitzsch). Reasons: *α.* According to Jer. xxvii. 7 the nations shall serve Nebuchadnezzar (Nabuchodonosor), his son, and his son's son. Now Laborosoarchod was the son's son or grandson of Nebuchadnezzar. Hence he was the last Babylonian king before Cyrus. *β.* The appearance of the queen in the history of Belshazzar supposes that the latter was very youthful; the same conclusion is reached from Dan. vi. 1, where it is intimated that a full-grown man took the place of a boy in the royal dignity. Now Berosus (cf. Jos. c. Ap. i. 20) tells us that Laborosoarchod reigned only nine months, and was then murdered by the Babylonian patriots, because he gave all the signs of a bad character, though he was still a boy. *γ.* As to the statement of Dan. viii. 1, in which the prophet speaks of the third year of Belshazzar, the patrons of this second view contend that Daniel there includes the years of Neriglissar, Laboroso-

archod's kinsman, who was regent in his place. There is hardly need to point out the fallacy of these arguments.

c. Belshazzar in the prophecies of Daniel and Baltassar occurring in Baruch are identical with Evilmerodach, the son and immediate successor of Nebuchadnezzar (Lapide, Tirinus, Hofmann, Haevernick, Öhler, Hupfeld, Niebuhr, Zündel, Keil, Kranichfeld, Kliefoth, Favre d'Envien). Reasons: *α*. Both Daniel and Baruch call Belshazzar Nebuchadnezzar's son, and this testimony is confirmed by several other inferences. *β*. A careful reading of the first four chapters of the prophet leaves one under the impression that Belshazzar is the immediate successor of Nebuchadnezzar. *γ*. Berosus' account of Evilmerodach agrees exactly with what we know of Belshazzar—of his luxury and his cruel tyranny. *δ*. These same characteristics render the appearance of the queen, the Median princess Amthea and wife of Nebuchadnezzar, quite natural, since Belshazzar had been entirely careless about business affairs which had happened under his predecessor. *ε*. If both Berosus and the canon of Ptolemaeus assign only two years to Evilmerodach's reign, they may be easily so divided as to give us three calendar years (Dan. viii. 1); besides, the canon of Syncellos expressly assigns three years to the reign of Evilmerodach. Boscawen has found among the Egibi-tablets inscriptions dated "the 23d day of the month Kislev of the third year of Marduk-sar-ussur." Now, Marduk is identical with Merodach, so that Marduk-sar-ussur and Evilmerodach (son of Merodach) are in all probability identical. May we not suppose that Evilmerodach assumed this name only when he ascended the throne on account of the Jewish Messianic hopes? His attempt to identify himself with the Redeemer promised by the Hebrew prophets would well explain the fact that Daniel has avoided the use of that name, since it must have been a true abomination in the eyes of the seer. *ζ*. Both Megasthenes and Berosus relate that Evilmerodach was murdered, so that Daniel's account of

Belshazzar's end agrees with the narrative of the historians. *η*. As to Dan. v. 30, 31, Daniel's gift of prophecy becomes even more striking, if we suppose that he predicted not only the imminent death of Belshazzar but also the far-off fate of the Babylonian empire, though Cyrus was not yet at the gates of the city. *θ*. It is also certain that Naboned named his second son Nebuchadnezzar after the great king who had borne that name; may we not then suppose that he called his first son Belshazzar, after Nebuchadnezzar's son, who was reigning at the time of Belshazzar's birth?

*ι*. The Belshazzar of the Book of Daniel is the Bel-sar-ussur of the Babylonian inscriptions, the first-born son of Naboned, who was ḫabalsarru or co-regent, even in the lifetime of his father. It must, however, be noted that even if this view be followed, the Baltassar of Baruch is Evilmerodach, the son of Nebuchadnezzar (Delattre, Düsterwald, Duncker, Schrader, etc.). Reasons: *α*. From the inscriptions it is not only certain that Naboned's first-born son was called Belshazzar, but it is equally certain that the father was especially interested in the advancement of his first-born. Belshazzar commanded the army in Accad even in the seventh year of his father's reign, who stayed at that time in Teva. Similar reports may be seen in the annals of the ninth, the tenth, and the eleventh years of Naboned's reign. *β*. The term ḫabalsarru, by which Belshazzar is known, must be regarded as a technical term for "viceroy." In this manner we remove, or satisfactorily explain, a number of difficulties: *γ*. In the taking of the city by Cyrus, no mention is made of Belshazzar, because, being at the head of the army, he must have been slain among the first. That his death was a well-known fact may be inferred from the circumstance that under the reign of Darius Hystaspis a pretender gave himself out to be Naboned's second son, Nebuchadnezzar, and as such he claimed the right to the Babylonian throne. *δ*. Again, Jeremias had predicted that God would give rule over the

nations to Nebuchadnezzar, his son, and his son's son. Now, according to Herodotus (i. 186-188), Naboned's mother was a person of extraordinary political importance. Knowing that Naboned himself did not belong to the royal family of the Babylonian kings, his mother, or, according to others, his wife, must have been the source of his right to the throne. She must therefore have been a daughter of the great Nebuchadnezzar, so that Belshazzar was really the great monarch's grandson (or great-grandson). It must not be inferred from this that the queen mentioned at the banquet of Belshazzar is the same as Naboned's mother or wife; for we know that the latter had died before the time of the banquet, on the fifth day of Nisan in the ninth year of Naboned. The queen mentioned by Daniel must be either Belshazzar's wife, or perhaps the wife of Naboned. ε. There is another fact mentioned in Dan. v. 7 and v. 16 which is fully explained by the present view. Belshazzar promised him who should satisfactorily interpret the vision the third rank in the kingdom. The question naturally presents itself: "Why the third?" From such passages as Gen. xli. 40, I. Kings xxiii. 17, and Esther x. 3, we expect that the successful interpreter will become the second personage in the realm. If we, therefore, suppose that Belshazzar himself was the second person in the kingdom, being only co-regent, it becomes clear why he promises the third place to the successful interpreter. ζ. Nor can it be said that if Belshazzar was only co-regent he could not be called king of Babylon. For we know that Nebuchadnezzar was called king of Babylon at a time when his father was certainly still alive (Dan. i. 1; Jer. xlvi. 2). Solomon and Assurbanipal too bore the legal title during their fathers' lifetime. Neriglissar too calls himself son of Bel-sum-iskun, king of Babylon. Now, Bel-sum-iskun, the first-born son of Nebuchadnezzar, died before his father. He must, therefore, have borne the name "king of Babylon" while his father still lived and reigned in Babylon.



**3. AUTHENTICITY OF THE PROPHECY.**—The authenticity of this prophecy must be specially treated, because Daniel's enemies have impugned it in a special manner. Not to mention their exception that it contains too clear a description of future events to be written at the time of Daniel,—as if the prophetic prediction of the future were impossible,—they explain all the prophetic visions of the book in such a manner that their last fulfilment falls in the time of the Machabees. About the time of the Machabees, therefore, the second part of Daniel, beginning with c. vii., must have been written. This manner of reasoning, besides being based on a false foundation—for we shall see that Daniel's visions do not terminate at the period of the Machabees—is directly refuted by the following positive argument. In the second part of Daniel we recognize the language of the prophet, his peculiar symbolism, and the manners of his country. On the other hand, no one at the time of the Machabees can be assigned who could have written in the same language, used the same symbols, and imitated the Babylonian manners so true to life. Hence, the second part of Daniel has been written by the prophet Daniel.

All the single statements implied in this argument rest on a solid foundation. *a.* The whole second part of Daniel, up to c. xii., is written in the style of the first part; c. vii. in particular is written in Chaldee, as are several of the preceding chapters. Thus the Babylonian people could understand the prophetic visions of Daniel and profit by them in so far as the Gentile world was permitted to be assisted by the Hebrew revelation. Then, c. vii. is entirely parallel to the explanation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream in c. ii.; c. viii. too explains certain of the preceding visions more in detail. The connection between the first and the second part of the book is, therefore, so intimate that if the first part is admitted to be authentic, the authenticity of the second follows as a matter of necessity. Finally, the Chaldee dialect, in which the seventh chapter has been

written, contains forms which are too ancient to be used by an author of a later period (cf. Baer and Delitzsch, ed. Daniel, Introductory Remarks).

b. Then, the second part of Daniel has an entirely Babylonian coloring. It is wholly different from the literary productions of Isaias and Jeremias, and indeed from anything that had up to Daniel's time been written by Hebrew authors. It may have been imitated after Daniel's time, but there was nothing in existence in Hebrew literature of which the Book of Daniel might be an imitation. Ezechiel's writings are the only ones that can in any way be compared with Daniel's; but then Ezechiel too wrote in Babylon. To illustrate what we have said, let us draw attention to the description of God in Dan. vii. In the Psalms, and even in Isaias, there may be found single figures and metaphors taken from human qualities and properties under which God Almighty is represented: he may be seated on a throne, exercise justice or mercy or power; but nowhere is the human image applied to God in its entirety as it is in Dan. vii. Here God is the Ancient of days, his garments are white as snow, and his hair is like clean wool; his throne is brilliant like the flame of fire, and a river of fire issues forth from the throne, and flows majestically before it. A thousand times a thousand servants attend on the Ancient of days, and myriads of ministers stand before him while he holds judgment. All this outward splendor surrounding God's majesty is easily understood if the Book of Daniel was written in Babylon; for the Babylonians were accustomed to the greatest display on the part of their kings, and needed therefore such a magnificent description of God in order to conceive a true idea of him. Had Dan. vii. been written in Palestine, at the time of the Machabees, such a representation of God would not only have been unintelligible, but would have been highly improper, since it might have encouraged the idolatrous worship that Antiochus had introduced into the

temple by erecting in it a statue of Jupiter Olympius (II. Mach. vi. 2).

c. But the second part of Daniel does not merely express the language and thoughts of Daniel; it does not merely exhibit Babylonian coloring in its description of even the most important subject, of God Almighty himself, but it also employs symbols and figures which are entirely Babylonian in their nature, and which cannot be understood in their full significance unless the Babylonian symbolism is understood. To return once more to the description that Daniel gives of God, it is in exact keeping with the Babylonian statue of the Ancient of days. The whiteness of the garments may still be recognized; the hair of its head entirely resembles the curls of wool, while its beard streams down in long white locks. The colossal size of the figure, its position on wheels, are in perfect agreement with Daniel's description. Then again, take the images of the beasts that the prophet introduces where he describes the divers kingdoms: the winged lion is a common Babylonian image, called in the text of the inscriptions "*nir-galli*," or lion of the good principle. The bear, the leopard, the ram, are one and all animals that occur again and again on the Babylonian monuments. Before the recovery of the Babylonian literature it was almost impossible to understand the meaning of the horns in the prophecies of Daniel. The beast with the ten horns, for instance, appeared rather a piece of unbridled fancy than an image worthy of a place in the prophetic visions. But now all this has been changed: in the Assyro-Chaldee sculpture we see winged lions and gods and heroes, all alike represented with horns. Some figures have four horns, others six; but in all cases the horns are a real ornament to the figure, arranged as they are in pairs, and in regular order. In Palestine our late explorers have searched in vain for traces and vestiges from which these images might have been borrowed. The Jordan and the sea, the dew of heaven and the vineyards of Judea, may have served Isaias and

Jeremias as the sources of their special imagery; but there is nothing in Palestine that could have suggested the symbols of the Book of Daniel. It follows, therefore, that the author of this book wrote under Assyrian and Babylonian influence, was acquainted with Chaldee myths and fables, and wrote for a people that must be impressed by figures and symbols taken from Babylonian sources. Daniel, therefore, is the only person who could have written the whole book now known under his name (cf. Fabre d'Énviu, pp. 556 ff.; Vigouroux, "*La Bible et les découverts mod.*," iv. p. 494).

**4. THE PROPHECY OF DANIEL HAS NOT BEEN TAKEN FROM BABYLONIAN SOURCES.**—The inscriptions mention a Silik-moulou-khi as mediator between the gods and men. His attributes are essentially human, and exercised for the benefit of the human race. Approaching his father Hea, the Ancient of days, he prays for and with men. Hea gives him the power to conquer the evil spirits, and in general the enemies of man (cf. Lenormant, "*La Magie*," sub v. Silik-moulou-khi). A later hymn identifies this mediator with the Chaldee-Babylonian Merodach, or Mardouk, and the Assyrian translators of the magic texts thus always translate the name "Silik-moulou-khi."

The mediatorial functions of the Silik-moulou-khi closely resemble those of the Sosiosh in the most ancient texts of the Zoroastrian religion, and those of Mithra in the Achaemenian dynasty. Mithra means "friend," and this is the equivalent of Silik-moulou-khi, which signifies "he who disposes good for men." Now M. Nicolas (*Des doctrines religieuses des Juifs*, p. 270) maintains that these mythological fables were precisely the sources from which Daniel drew his predictions. "Change the names in the Mazdean drama," the author says, "and you will fancy yourself reading a Jewish apocalypse. There are resemblances affecting the minor points of detail. The fifth monarchy of Daniel corresponds to the fifth dynasty founded by the liberator Sosiosh. The prince of the evil spirits who places

himself at the head of the idolatrous people to fight against the chosen people of God resembles greatly the prince of darkness leading the Devas and the impure nations against the prince of light and his worshippers. The Messianic reign of a thousand years recalls the 'hazare,' or similar period of the two precursors (Oshedar-Bami and Oshedar-Mah) of the modern liberator. And in the Jewish apocalypse as in the Mazdean eschatology, a resurrection of the dead is placed at the commencement of the reign of the deliverer and of the proclamation of a new law." From these parallel features the author infers: "The doctors of the Synagogue, without absolutely intending it, without perhaps being altogether conscious of their act, recalled Persian opinions to aid them in the explanation of the Messianic expectation of their fathers."

A little reflection will show that the above inferences are not entirely legitimate: 1. They imply that the prophecies of Daniel have been written at a comparatively recent date, at the Machabean period, for instance. Now it has been already shown that this supposition is not admissible. 2. Even if we were to admit the late authorship, it would be most improbable that at that late date the Jews should have had recourse to the mythology of an extinct power in order to explain their own national teachings, for which they had repeatedly risked life and liberty. 3. It is impossible to explain the doctrines of either Hebrew or Persian system satisfactorily, if imitation, reproduction, or adaptation are the ultimate cause of their presence in either creed. 4. The presentiments and predictions found among the Babylonians and Persians are nothing but a dim and floating vision of a better future, with nothing in the past or present to which they can attach themselves; they are, therefore, destitute of moral power and practical results. But Daniel's Messianic doctrine is living, coherent, and in keeping with the whole Hebrew system of Messianic predictions and expectations. 5. Finally, it is sufficient to put side by side the fabulous and extravagant myths of the Per-

sians with the sober and earnest prophecies of the Hebrew seer in order to be convinced of their distinct origin. Compare, for instance, Daniel's abomination of desolation, his decreed ruin and downfall with the Mazdean torrents of blood, powerful enough to turn mill-wheels, or with the Persian comet Gurzshehr precipitating itself on the earth, and making men, both pure and impure, pass through a fiery stream of molten metal.

**5. MESSIANIC CHARACTER OF DANIEL'S PROPHECY.**—The reference of Daniel's prophecy to the Messiah is principally inferred from its announcement of the "son of man." To prove that this latter term is a Messianic name is to establish the Messianic character of the whole prediction. 1. The first proof for the reference of the "son of man" to the Messiah may be based on Old Testament passages in which God's coming is connected with phenomena similar to those accompanying the advent of the son of man: Ex. xiii. 21, 22; xiv. 24; Ps. civ. 3; Nah. 1, 3; Is. xix. 1; xiv. 14; Ex. xvi. 10; xix. 9; xxiv. 16; xxxiii. 9; xxxiv. 5; Lev. xvi. 2; Num. ix. 15; x. 34; xi. 25; Deut. xxxi. 15; Ps. xvii. 10; xvi. 2 ff.; III. Kings viii. 10–12; II. Par. vi. 1; Ezech. i. 4; x. 3, etc. Besides these passages in which God's appearance is described as resembling that of the son of man, we may draw attention to the fact that according to the Old Testament prophecies universal dominion belongs to the Messiah: Gen. xlix. 10; Ps. ii. 6; xlv. 5 f.; lxxi. 1 f.; Is. xi. 10; xlix. 6; liii. 11; Jer. xxiii. 5; xxx. 21; Ezech. xxxiv. 23; Mich. v. 4, etc. Now according to Daniel, all power and dominion over all the nations and tribes of the earth is given to the "son of man." He is therefore identical with the Messiah of the other prophecies.

2. That the "son of man" is identical with the Messiah is still more patent from the New Testament. The expression occurs not less than 82 times in the Gospels: in that of Matthew, 30 times; in that of Mark, 14 times; in that of Luke, 26 times; in that of John, 12 times. Besides,



the expression occurs in Acts vii. 55 and in Apoc. i. 13; xiv. 14. It is hardly probable that the New Testament should use this expression so often in the same meaning, applying it invariably to Jesus Christ, without ever indicating that it has in Daniel a different signification, had Daniel really used it in a different meaning. But more than this: Jesus expressly applies Daniel's description of the "son of man" to himself where he speaks about the last judgment: Matt. xxiv. 30; Mark xiii. 26; cf. Apoc. i. 7, and especially where he stands before the judgment of Caiaphas and gives solemn testimony of his Messiasship, Matt. xxvi. 63, 64; cf. Act. vii. 58. It is therefore certain beyond all reasonable doubt that the New Testament views the expression "son of man" as a peculiarly Messianic title.

3. The reference of the "son of man" to the Messiah is also evident from the Book of Enoch, xli. 1-3. Even an author so little open to suspicion as Schürer has it (*The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, II. iii. p. 69): "Further, the objection based upon the circumstance that, according to Matt. xvi. 13-16, John xii. 34, the expression 'son of man' was not as yet a current designation for the Messiah in the time of Christ, whereas it is of frequent occurrence in this sense in the allegories (of the Book of Enoch), is without force. For we are by no means at liberty to infer from those passages that the expression 'son of man' was not at that time currently in use as a Messianic title. In the case of the passage in John this inference is based simply upon false exegesis. The passage in Matthew again is disposed of by the circumstance that, in its original form as preserved in Mark viii. 27; Luke ix. 18, the expression 'son of man' does not occur at all." The Sibylline oracles too apply the expression "son of man" to the Messiah; for in lib. iii. we have nothing but a paraphrase of the passage in Daniel (cf. Düsterwald, p. 179):

*ἦξει ἐν νεφέλῃ πρὸς ἄφθιτον ἄφθιτος αὐτός  
ἐν δόξῃ Χριστός σὺν ἀμύνοσι ἀγγελιῆρσι  
καὶ καδίσει κ.τ.λ.*

4. For the testimonies of the Fathers concerning the real meaning of the expression "son of man," we refer our reader to the passages indicated in Kilber's *Analysis Biblica*, ed. II. i. 465. It appears from these testimonies as well as from the views expressed by the scholastics and by the more recent theologians that Christian tradition is practically unanimous in considering "the son of man" as a Messianic title.

5. Considering this agreement between the Old and the New Testament, between the apocryphal and the Christian tradition regarding the meaning of the expression "son of man," it cannot astonish us to find that Jewish tradition too harmonizes with these religious sources. The Talmud (*Sanhedrin*, fol. 38, col. 2; cf. *Hagigah*, fol. 14, col. 1) has the following comment on *Dan. vii. 9*: "What will this say? (the placing of the thrones). One throne for himself, and one for David, these are the words of Rabbi Akiba. Said to him Rabbi Jose: Akiba, how long wilt thou render the Shechinah profane?" The peculiar meaning of the Shechinah in Jewish theology is well enough defined to show that the passage was evidently regarded as Messianic, and could not, therefore, be applied to David without seeming profanity.

The Talmud (*Sanhedrin*, fol. 98, col. 1) interprets *Dan. vii. 13*: "Rabbi Joshua ben Levi asked: In one place it is written, 'Behold one like the son of man, etc.,' and in another, 'Lowly and riding upon an ass' (*Zach. ix. 9*). (He answered), If they be worthy, he (the Messiah) will come with the clouds of heaven; if not, he will come lowly and riding upon an ass." Similar Messianic references we find in the later Jewish writers: Saadia, for instance, who flourished in the ninth century, has the following passage: "This (one like the son of man) is the Messiah our righteousness; for is it not written with reference to Messiah, 'Lowly and riding upon an ass? (*Zach. ix. 9*.) Surely he comes in humility, for he does not come upon a horse, in glory. But since it is written, With the clouds of heaven,

it signifies the angels of the heavenly hosts, which is the great glory the Creator will give to the Messiah, as it is written, With the clouds of heaven. Then he shall be great in government. When it is said, The Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like pure wool, he speaks after the manner of men. They brought him to the Ancient of days; for it is written (Ps. cix. 1), The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand; and there was given him dominion, i.e., he gave to him a government and a kingdom, as it is written (Ps. ii. 6), Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Sion; and as it is written (I. Kings ii. 10), He shall exalt the horn of his anointed; his kingdom shall not depart, and shall not be destroyed for ever and ever."

We may add here the testimony of the Midrash on Numbers (vi. 22, sect. 11): "Because the Israelites observed the law among them (the Edomites), the Holy One will make them inherit in the future the throne of glory, as it is said, And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness. . . ." See also Abarbanel (Comm. in h. l. fol. 50, col. 1); Jarchiades (Jer. xxxiii. 6); David Kimchi (Comm. in Zach. 93); Jarchi, R. Simeon.

#### DAN. VII.

In the first year of Baltassar king of Babylon, Daniel saw a dream and the vision of his head was upon his bed, and writing the dream, he comprehended it in few words, and relating the sum of it in short, he said: I saw in my vision by night, and behold the four winds of heaven strove upon the great sea. <sup>1</sup>And four great beasts, different one from another, came up out of the

<sup>1</sup>And four great beasts. It appears to be generally admitted that the seventh and the second chapters of Daniel refer to the same events. In both chapters there is question of four kingdoms, though the symbols by which the kingdoms are represented are different in the two chapters. In the second chapter it was Nabuchodonosor who saw the symbols; hence they were such as represented the kingdoms only *from without*, as it were. The different kingdoms of the world in their fullest glory are but component parts of one colossal figure, bearing the outward resemblance of a man. The power of God's

sea. The first was like a lioness, and had the wings of an eagle. I

kingdom is but humble, as a stone cut without hands. But on the other hand, gold, silver, brass, iron, are only man's handiwork; while the stone representing the kingdom of God is not made by man, "cut without hands." But though interpreters recognize the substantial identity of the events foretold in the second and the seventh chapters, they differ regarding almost all particulars of these two passages of Daniel.

VARIOUS EXPLANATIONS.—*a.* A number of Protestant interpreters have viewed the four kingdoms of Daniel, not as four distinct kingdoms, but rather as four distinct periods of the same Babylonian kingdom (Benzel, von der Hardt, Harenberg, Döderlein, Scharfenberg). It is astonishing that a view which hardly needs a word of refutation on account of its inherent improbability has found so many adherents even among able men of science. It has been ably refuted by Bertholdt.

*b.* Another explanation regards not the Babylonian, but the Assyrian kingdom as the first reign spoken of by Daniel (Ewald, Bunsen). But the prophet's text itself is evidently against this theory, so that Ewald has retracted his opinion in the later edition of his work, "Die Propheten des alten Bundes." Zündel has lately refuted this view, though it is hardly worth that much attention on account of the scarcity of its defenders.

*c.* According to an explanation that dates back to Porphyry, the first kingdom is the Babylonian; the second, the Medo-Persian; the third, the kingdom of Alexander; the fourth, the kingdom of Alexander's successors. This interpretation counts among its adherents such writers as Grotius, J. Chr. Beermann, Rosenmüller, L. Bertholdt, O. Zöckler, and the Catholic authors Jahn and G. K. Mayer. Its refutation will be given below.

*d.* Hitzig and Redepennig have sought a new way out of the difficulties that Daniel's prediction implies for all Rationalistic authors. The first kingdom is that of Nabuchodonosor; the second, that of his successors; the third, the Medo-Persian; the fourth, the Macedo-Grecian. The refutation of this theory will be found under the next number.

*e.* There is another explanation of the four kingdoms that may be called both ancient and recent, since it has been defended by several of the patristic writers and is still defended by a great number of scholars in our days. The first kingdom is according to this theory the Babylonian; the second is the Median; the third, the Persian; the fourth, the Greek-Syrian (Ephrem, Cosmas Indicopleustes, Jahn, Dereser, Scholz, Bade, Loch, and Reischl, and the Protestant writers, Newton, Bleek, Delitzsch, Desprez, Eichhorn, Ewald, Hilgenfeld, Kranichfeld, Gaussen, von Lengerke, Maurer, de Wette). It may be said, in general, that nearly all those writers who place the authorship of Daniel in the time of the Machabees have found it convenient to adhere to this explanation of the four kingdoms.

As to proofs for the interpretation, we shall enumerate the reasons advanced for the single kingdoms in order. 1. In ii. 38 Daniel says expressly to Nabuchodonosor: "Thou therefore art the head of gold."

beheld till her wings were plucked off, and she was lifted up from

Now the head of gold represents the first kingdom, so that Nabuchodonosor represents the first of Daniel's four kingdoms. The question which comes up at this point regards the circumstance whether Nabuchodonosor personally is the head of gold, so that his successor may be the second kingdom, or whether the kingdom of Nabuchodonosor is symbolized by the head of gold. We decidedly defend this latter view against Hitzig and his followers. This is clear from the context of the above words. For in ii. 39 we read: "and after thee shall rise up another kingdom. . . ." Now the last three words of this promise furnish so many arguments for the view that Nabuchodonosor's kingdom and not his person was symbolized by the head of gold. A KINGDOM, not a mere king, was to rise up after the monarch, showing that the second symbol represented a kingdom, not the person of a king. Again, the kingdom was to RISE UP after Nabuchodonosor; therefore it did not exist at his time, nor was it merely to pass over to another ruler. Thirdly, ANOTHER kingdom was to rise up after Nabuchodonosor, so that the second symbol could not apply to either Nabuchodonosor's kingdom as governed by his successor, or to the person of his successor. Besides, Hitzig himself explains Dan. vii. as referring to the Babylonian, the Median, the Persian, and the Greek kingdoms; why then follow a different explanation in Dan. ii.? The author's assumption that Daniel knew only two Babylonian kings, Nabuchodonosor and Baltassar, is wholly gratuitous; the person who wrote under the name of Daniel did not live long before Josephus, if Hitzig's theory is correct. Now, Josephus (*Antiq.* X. xi. 2) knew as many as three successors of Nabuchodonosor. What right have we then to suppose that Pseudo-Daniel knew less about Babylonian history? But besides all this, we have shown above that most probably Baltassar was no king at all, being only the co-regent of his father, Naboned. How then could Daniel represent him by the second symbol as the second kingdom?

2. The second kingdom of Daniel is the Median. Reasons: *a.* The symbols themselves represent the Median kingdom admirably. According to Dan. ii. it is imaged by silver, which is inferior to gold; according to Dan. vii. it is like a bear standing up on one side, and having three rows in its mouth and devouring much flesh. Now, Darius the Mede was far inferior to Nabuchodonosor, having power only in one part of the preceding kingdom; still, he ruled over three peoples—the Medes, the Persians, and the Babylonians—and devoured much flesh when subduing and destroying the kingdom of the Babylonians. *b.* According to Lengerke, Daniel has conceived the rule of the Medes as succeeding that of the Babylonians, following in this view a tradition found in Xenophon rather than the trustworthy record of Herodotus (I. 130; cf. VIII. 8). For Xenophon has it that Cyrus subdued Babylonia in the name of the Median king Cyaxares II. *c.* This explanation of Daniel is confirmed by his symbol of the ram in the eighth chapter. For the two horns of this ram clearly show that Daniel considers the Medes and the Persians as constituting two distinct kingdoms. *d.* A similar argument for Daniel's dividing the Medo-Persian rule into two kingdoms is derived from Dan. v. 28,

the earth, and stood upon her feet as a man, and the heart of a

where the prophet speaks of the Medes and the Persians, inverting the order of Is. xxi. 2; again, Delitzsch calls attention to the circumstance that in Dan. vi. 1; ix. 1; xi. 1, Darius is expressly noted as being a Mede, while in vi. 29 Cyrus is said to be a Persian. The inspired writer, therefore, distinguished the Medes and the Persians from each other. *c.* The description of the second kingdom (Dan. vii. 5) exactly fits in with the circumstance that the kingdom of the Medes, like those of the Babylonians and the Persians, embraced warlike and aggressive nations. The value of these arguments will appear when we shall speak of the next theory concerning the four kingdoms.

3. As to the third kingdom, it must be observed in the first place that the symbol exhibited in the prophet cannot be understood of the kingdom of Alexander so as to exclude his successors. Hengstenberg has satisfactorily proved that at the time of the Maccabees no such distinction was made between Alexander and his successors as to warrant us in considering the former as the third and the latter as the fourth kingdom. As to the other reasons that Bertholdi and his adherents give for such a separation, they are one and all founded upon the subjective view of Daniel's prophecies, which are peculiar to those interpreters, and cannot claim any serious attention on account of their own intrinsic probability. It necessarily follows from what has been said of the second kingdom, as compared with what will be said of the fourth, that the third can only be the kingdom of the Persians.

4. The fourth kingdom is symbolized in chapter vii. by a beast with ten horns, from among which rises a little horn before which three of the ten are plucked up by the roots. *α.* This division finds its fulfilment in the successors of Alexander, or even in Alexander together with his successors. Nor can it be said that Dan. viii. 8 is against such an interpretation, since in that passage four monarchies, not ten, are enumerated as following that of Alexander. For the lesser kingdoms into which the kingdom of Alexander was divided were reckoned sometimes as four, ruled by Seleucus Nicator, Lysimachus, Ptolemy Lagi, and Cassander, or as ten under the generals who, after the death of their chief, divided his provinces among themselves. All these kingdoms existed contemporaneously, and therefore satisfy the literal requirements of the text. *β.* Again, critics are almost unanimous in referring the little horn of Dan. viii. to Antiochus Epiphanes. But the little horn of c. viii. must be identical with that of c. vii. Hence Antiochus Epiphanes must be represented by the little horn in c. vii. Now Antiochus, Syrian as he was, took his rise from the Græco-Macedonian dynasty, and at the same time from the fourth kingdom. The latter must then be identical with the Græco-Macedonian kingdom. That the little horn of c. vii. is identical with that of c. viii. may be seen by comparing vii. 8, 11, 20, 21, 24-26 with viii. 9-12, 22-25. The same may be confirmed by referring to xi. 21 f. As to the precise persons who are to be reckoned among the ten, authors differ; the lists of Bleek, Rosenmüller, Hitzig, Porphyry, etc., may be seen in Düsterwald, pp. 110, 111, 112, 113.

*γ.* Finally, we come to what we may name the traditional explana-



man was given to her. And behold another beast like a bear stood

tion of Daniel's four kingdoms. For we find it in all ages of the Church, from the patristic writers down to the most recent interpreters. The names of the most prominent adherents of this view will serve both as proof for its constant presence in the Church and as external evidence for its truth. The explanation is stated and proved by Origen, Hippolytus, Eusebius of Cæsarea, Apollinaris of Laodicea, Cyril of Jerusalem, Ammonius of Alexandria, Jerome, Theodoret of Cyrus. Walafrid Strabo received this theory into the "*glosa ordinaria*" (849), and, as our very opponents affirm, it has become "*canonical*" since that time. Throughout the middle ages it reigned almost alone in the world of commentators, so that even Luther maintains: "In this interpretation and opinion the whole world is unanimous, and the work itself as well as history is a powerful proof for it." There were indeed a few opponents to this view in the second half of the seventeenth century; a passing opposition arose also in the eighteenth, and in the nineteenth the number of adversaries has grown to a still greater extent. But the number of defenders of the view increased with the number of its opponents, so that the most recent interpreters are about evenly divided for and against this explanation. Among the older interpreters, St. Thomas, Pererius, Maldonatus, Estius, a Lapide, Sanchez, Rupert of Deutz, Tirinus, and Calmet deserve to be named among the upholders of the traditional interpretation. Among the recent writers we have the Catholics: Allioli, Reinke, Welte, Rohling, Kaulen, G. K. Mayer, Düsterwald, Knabenbauer, Fabre d'Envieu, together with the Protestants: Auberlen, Caspari, Füller, Haevernick, v. Hofmann, Hengstenberg, Kliefoth, Gärtner, Menken, Preiswerk, Pusey, Reichel, Volck, Zeise, and Zündel, forming one solid array for the defence of the traditional explanation. Finally, it must be noted that the same opinion may be traced back to the fourth Book of Esdras, and to the epistle attributed to St. Barnabas, and has been adopted by the Targum of Jonathan, Josephus, the Talmud, R. Albo, and other Hebrew writers of great weight.

After stating the extrinsic evidence in favor of the so called traditional explanation of Daniel's four kingdoms, we must examine the theory according to its intrinsic worth. The first kingdom is considered to be the Babylonian, the second the Medo-Persian, the third the Græco-Macedonian, the fourth the Roman. A word must be said about the single kingdoms:

1. The first kingdom is the Babylonian. The proofs for this part are the same as those advanced by the adherents of the preceding explanation, since in this point there is no difference between the two interpretations.

2. The second kingdom is the Medo-Persian. In point of fact, there has never been a distinction between the Median and the Persian dynasty ruling on the throne of Babylon. This has been sufficiently established by Hengstenberg, but our non-Catholic opponents are in no way inconvenienced by this fact, since they freely grant that Daniel erred in distinguishing between the two kingdoms. In order to meet them in this position, we must show that even Daniel

up on one side, and there were three rows in the mouth thereof,

regards the Medo-Persian dynasty as forming one kingdom : *a.* In Dan. v. 28 it is foretold : "Thy kingdom is divided and is given to the Medes and Persians." Now the fulfilment of this prediction is expressly stated in Dan. vi. 1, where it appears that Babylon is not divided between two different rulers, but is ruled by a dynasty consisting of two nations (cf. vi. 8, 12, 15). If then Daniel had regarded the Medes and the Persians as two distinct kingdoms, he would have contradicted himself within the range of a few verses. *b.* The same inference may be drawn from the circumstance that Daniel predicts "thy kingdom . . . is given to the Medes and Persians." The rule of the two is, therefore, represented as contemporaneous, not as successive, in point of time. It appears to be evident from the whole context of the passage that Daniel knows only of one kingdom following that of Baltassar, and, therefore, the Medo-Persian dynasty is regarded by Daniel as only one reign. *c.* The original text of the words "is divided" (*peres perisat*) is used by Daniel with evident allusion to the Persians, so that the word means both "thy kingdom is divided," and "thy kingdom is rendered Persian." Still, the prophet continues in the same passage : "and is given to the Medes and Persians." Therefore the Babylonian kingdom is rendered Persian in such a manner as to pass over into the hands of the Medes and Persians. It would be hard to find a more cogent proof for the undivided state of the Medo-Persian kingdom than this playful allusion of the prophet. Nor can it be maintained that the inspired writer employs this expression "is rendered Persian" because he had no verb to express the double idea of "is divided" and "is rendered Median." For had he wished to express that idea, the verb "*madad*" would have fitted exactly into his text. *d.* This view is rendered equally evident by Dan. vi. 8, 12, 15. For in these three verses the courtiers of Darius speak of the unchangeable character of the "decree of the Medes and Persians." Had the two nations not been united, this language would be unintelligible. For it would surely have been equal to high treason, especially at an oriental court, to speak before the monarch of the custom or law or decree of another nation. *e.* The very symbolism employed by Daniel to represent the second kingdom seems to require such a double dynasty as we find in that of the Medes and Persians. In the second chapter the second kingdom is represented by the breast and arms of the statue, while in the seventh chapter its symbol is the bear standing on one side. Both these figures suppose a dual character of the second dynasty. Again, it would be hard to explain the three rows in the mouth of the bear and the words "arise, devour much flesh," as applying to the kingdom of the Medes. For whatever may be said to the contrary, Darius was certainly not blood-thirsty enough to be represented as having devoured much flesh : the various attempts made to explain the three rows satisfactorily of Darius show the weakness of the whole theory. *f.* Finally, we must draw attention to the fact that the Median kingdom would be a strange dynasty, indeed, if it had ever been separated in Babylon from the Persian. How could we in that case explain that a Per-

and in the teeth thereof, and thus they said to it: Arise, devour

sian reigns after Darius without there being the least indication of any strife or bloodshed between Medes and Persians? On the other hand, the second kingdom might well be called "inferior" (Dan. ii. 39) to the Babylonian, if it belonged to the Medes and Persians. For its dual character would lessen its internal strength sufficiently to place it below the well-united Babylonian dynasty.

We have not yet stated that the person of Darius the Mede is enveloped in the greatest mystery. Without entering here into a full discussion of his identity, we merely enumerate the different opinions that have been entertained in regard to this question. The Book of Daniel gives such vague information that it is impossible to come to a definite conclusion from the data that it supplies. Darius has been identified with a nephew of Nabuchodonosor (Theodoret), with Cyrus the Persian (Boscawen), with Naboned (Scaliger), with Darius Hystaspis (Bosanquet), with Astyages, the predecessor of Cyrus (many ancient interpreters, M. Niebuhr), with Neriglissar, the successor of Evilmerodach (Gutschmidt, Fabre d'Enviu), with Cyaxares II., mentioned in Xenophon's *Cyrop.* (Joseph, Jerome, Bertholdt, v. Lengerke, etc.), with Gobryas mentioned by Herodotus and Xenophon, and Ugbaru mentioned in Naboned's annals (Babelon). Though we cannot here determine which of these views is the more correct one, we may at least infer from the relation which Cyrus holds with relation to the various persons identified with Darius the Mede that the kingdom of the Medes is not distinct from that of the Persians.

3. The third kingdom of which Daniel speaks is not the Persian, nor that of Alexander as distinct from that of his successors, but it is the Macedo-Greek kingdom. It is clear from Daniel that the third kingdom will have three special characteristics: it will extend over the whole earth; its conquests will be exceedingly rapid; and it will be divided into four regencies. Starting from these facts, we may advance the following proofs in support of our contention: *a.* It has been shown above that the Persian kingdom is one with the Median, both being represented by the prophet as the second kingdom. Hence the third kingdom must differ from the Persian. *b.* It has been shown too that the third kingdom is not Alexander's kingdom as distinct from that of his successors. Hence nothing else remains than that the third kingdom must be that of Alexander and his successors, or the Macedo-Greek kingdom. *c.* Both conclusions, from which this last inference has been drawn, are confirmed by Dan. viii. In this chapter the prophet sees two beasts representing two kingdoms, identical with two of the four kingdoms represented by the four beasts of Dan. vii. Since in these visions the characteristics of the kingdoms are more minutely described than in the visions of the seventh chapter, and since the prophet himself applies them to definite kings, it will be found serviceable for the determination of the meaning of the four beasts in the seventh chapter to consider the symbols of the eighth.

*α.* The first vision is described viii. 3 ff.: "And I lifted up my eyes, and saw: and behold, a ram stood before the water, having two high horns, and one higher than the other, and growing up. Afterward

much flesh. After this I beheld, and lo another like a leopard,

I saw the ram pushing with his horns against the west, and against the north, and against the south, and no beasts could withstand him, nor be delivered out of his hand, and he did according to his own will, and became great, and I understood." Then, in verse 20, the prophet is told: "The ram which thou sawest with horns is the king of the Medes and Persians." This last passage of the prophet ought to suffice as a proof that Daniel did not regard the kingdoms of the Medes and Persians as distinct, and could not therefore reckon the Median dynasty as the second and the Persian dynasty as the third kingdom. But we have seen already that our opponents are by no means disturbed by this inference. According to them, Daniel is ignorant of the Medo-Persian history in the second chapter, and in the eighth he has forgotten what he has written in the seventh. For men who recur to subterfuges like these it is not sufficient proof that Daniel nowhere else symbolizes independent kingdoms by horns; the latter are either kings (vii. 5, 3, 21; viii. 9, 23) or smaller dependent realms (viii. 8, 22), or finally nations which constitute a larger kingdom. Hence the Medo-Persian dynasty is in chapter viii. not symbolized by two horns, but by a ram with two horns. Now this representation exactly agrees with the figure of the second kingdom in chapters ii. and vii. In the former the second kingdom is represented by the silver breast and the arms of the statue, while in chapter vii. it is symbolized by the bear standing on one side. The natural inference is that the second kingdom of chapters ii. and vii. is the Medo-Persian kingdom.

*β.* In a similar manner we can show that the second animal seen by the prophet in chapter viii. represents the third kingdom of the four symbolized in chapters ii. and vii., and that this third kingdom is the Macedo-Greek dynasty. The second beast is described in chapter viii. 5 ff.: "And behold, a he-goat came from the west on the face of the whole earth, and he touched not the ground, and the he-goat had a notable horn between his eyes. And he went up to the ram that had the horns, which I had seen standing before the gate, and he ran towards him in the force of his strength. And when he was come near the ram, he was enraged against him, and struck the ram, and broke his two horns, and the ram could not withstand him; and when he had cast him down on the ground, he stamped upon him, and none could deliver the ram out of his hand. And the he-goat became exceeding great, and when he was grown the great horn was broken, and there came up four horns under it towards the four winds of heaven." Daniel again applies this vision expressly in verse 21: "And the he goat is the king of the Greeks, and the great horn that was between his eyes, the same is the first. . . ." All this is stated so clearly in the prophecy that no one can contradict it who admits Daniel's authority at all. But now the question arises: with which of the four beasts must we identify the he-goat, and with which of the four kingdoms must we identify the Macedo-Greek kingdom, represented by the he-goat?

*α* The he goat follows immediately upon the ram whose two horns he breaks. Now the ram represents the second kingdom; hence the

and it had upon it four wings as of a fowl, and the beast had

he-goat, or the Macedo Greek dynasty, must be the third kingdom. The symbol of the third kingdom given in c. vii. perfectly agrees with the symbol of the Macedo-Greek kingdom represented in c. viii. Both the leopard and the he-goat are noted for their swiftness, and, to emphasize this characteristic still more, the leopard has four wings, as of a fowl; both leopard and he-goat are noted for their division into four—the former has four heads, the latter has four horns. This agreement becomes much more striking if it is compared with the result of our opponents. For according to them the he-goat with four horns must be identified with the fourth beast of the seventh chapter, terrible and wonderful, and exceeding strong, with great iron teeth, eating and breaking in pieces, and treading down the rest with its feet, and having ten horns. On the other hand, the leopard with four heads must be identified with the ram having two high horns. Such an explanation resembles more the bitter satire of an enemy of all revealed truth than the reverence of a believer in God's prophetic inspiration.

b. And what is the foundation of our opponents' theory of the four kingdoms? Their principal argument rests on their view of the little horn that comes forth out of one of the four horns of the he-goat. Now, the little horn is, according to all interpreters, Antiochus Epiphanes. But the same little horn appears in the fourth kingdom of the seventh chapter. Hence, Antiochus Epiphanes will follow and grow out of the fourth kingdom, so that the latter can be no other than the Macedo-Greek kingdom. But if the Macedo Greek kingdom is the fourth, the third must precede it, and must therefore be the Persian. It is evident that the whole force of this argument lies in the identity of the little horn that appears in the seventh chapter with the little horn that appears in the eighth. This identity we deny most emphatically, relying on Daniel's own words for our arguments. According to c. vii. the little horn grows between the ten horns; according to c. viii. it grows out of one of the four horns; according to the former chapter it destroys three other horns, according to c. viii. no such destruction is mentioned—the little horn of c. vii. has the eyes and the mouth of a man, that of c. viii. has nothing of the kind to characterize it; in the seventh chapter the beast with the little horn is slain, and its carcass is thrown into the fire, while the eighth chapter knows nothing of this fate of the beast. And these discrepancies are the more striking, since on the whole the little horn of the seventh chapter is more minutely described than that of the eighth. The whole Book of Daniel being progressive in its development, such a feature would be impossible were the little horn of the seventh chapter identical with that of the eighth.

4. The fourth kingdom is not the Macedo-Greek one, nor the one following it under Alexander's successors, but the Roman. Besides the difficulties that have already been mentioned as opposing the view that the kingdom of Alexander or that of his successors is the fourth kingdom of the prophet, we must here draw attention to the circumstance that according to the same view the ten horns of c. vii. are wholly unintelligible. Keeping in mind that the ten horns must



four heads and power was given to it. After this I beheld in the

be distinctly perceptible if the prophecy has been fulfilled, we may review some of the principal explanations of the ten horns given by our opponents.

*a.* The first class of interpreters is right in assuming that the ten horns represent ten simultaneous kings; for Dan. vii. 7, 24 distinctly describes the rulers as living at the same time. But when those authors come to name the ten kings indicated by the prophet, their task is not such an easy one. At best, they proceed wholly gratuitously, since ancient writers, both sacred and profane, enumerate as many as thirty successors of Alexander, out of which number the ten must be selected (Justin. hist. xiii. 4; Diodor. xviii 3, 4; Arrian and Dexippus in Phot. cod. 92, p. 69, cod. 82, p. 64; Curtius, x. 30). It is therefore not at all surprising that every one who has attempted this selection of the ten kings differs from his predecessors. Bleek, Amner, and Rosenmüller illustrate this statement (cf. Düsterwald, p. 110, note).

*b.* The opinion of a second class of interpreters, which seeks the ten kings among the Seleucide, appears improbable, even prescinding from the enumeration of names. For instead of considering ten principal kingdoms, as the text of Daniel requires, these authors speak of a branch kingdom; and instead of enumerating ten contemporary kings, they appeal to ten successive rulers. Besides, they cannot even find ten kings in their line of rulers, for three, Heliodorus, Ptolemy Philometor, and Demetrius, are not kings, but only pretenders to the throne. Zückler abandons the task of enumerating the ten kings, believing that it is impossible, and that Daniel intends only a round, symbolic number by his ten horns.

*c.* Hitzig has lately returned to a hypothesis which had been tried even by Porphyry. He assumes it as certain that the little horn represents Antiochus Epiphanes, and then endeavors to count up ten kings among his predecessors in the Seleucide-family. The first of the ten is Alexander the Great, the ninth and tenth are Heliodorus and Demetrius. We have seen already that the latter two never were kings, and cannot therefore belong to the prophetic series of Daniel. Alexander was king indeed, but he neither belonged to the family of Seleucus, nor can he be considered as the latter's predecessor, since the Syrian realm was only a branch of Alexander's kingdom.

*d.* Gutschmid (Rhein Museum 1860, pp. 316-318; cf. Ewald, Jahrb. xi. 222) has tried another manner of supplying at least one of the deficiencies in the above hypothesis by assuming an unknown son of Seleucus Philopator. It is true that Heliodorus is thus eliminated from the list of kings, but only to make place for another candidate whose very existence is uncertain.

*e.* We must therefore explain the ten prophetic kings as belonging to the Roman empire. But here, again, different authors have proposed different views concerning the individual rulers spoken of:

*a.* Many interpreters regard the term of the prediction as coinciding with the first coming of Christ. The ten horns are then generally applied to the ten persecutors of the Christians, and the little horn is either Diocletian (Calmet), or Galerius (G. K. Mayer), or again Julian



vision of the night, and lo a fourth beast terrible and wonderful and exceeding strong ; it had great iron teeth, eating and breaking in pieces, and treading down the rest with its feet ; and it was unlike the other beasts which I had seen before it, and had ten horns. I considered the horns, and behold another little horn sprung out of the midst of them, and three of the first horns were plucked up at the presence thereof ; and behold eyes like the eyes of a man were in this horn, and a mouth speaking great things.

I beheld <sup>2</sup> till thrones were placed, and the Ancient of days sat.

the Apostate. Vespasian too is at times identified with the little horn, because he subdued the three other horns : Galba, Otho, and Vitellins. We need not say that according to this view the ten kings are not simultaneous rulers.

β. Another explanation regards the second coming of Christ as the term of Daniel's prophecy, and the ten kings must be explained accordingly. They are either represented as preceding the advent of Christ, independently of the Roman empire, or the latter is viewed as still virtually existing, and as destined to be split into ten kingdoms before the second coming of Christ. This last theory seems to satisfy all the requirements of Daniel's prediction better than the preceding explanations.

<sup>2</sup> I beheld till thrones were placed. After considering the actions of the beasts and of the horns for a space of time, the prophet's attention is invited to another scene. Judgment is about to be pronounced against the little horn and its adherents, and the solemnity and importance of this event is clearly shown in the magnificent description of its preparations. It must be remembered that this judgment is not the last judgment, as Theodoret and a number of the ancient interpreters have believed, but that it precedes the last judgment, taking place in heaven, and having for judge the "Ancient of days," or God the Father (cf. Apoc. iv. 2-11 ; v. 5-10). The phenomena of fire accompanying the judgment have their parallels in Deut. iv. 24 and Ps. xcvi. (xcvii.) 2, 3 ; the books are opened also in Apoc. xx. 12. We have seen already that "one like the Son of man" is no one else but the Messias. The opinion that this one represented either the Jewish community (the later Rabbinic commentators), or the Roman state, which was then without king (cf. I. Mach. viii. 26 ; Grotius) evidently contradicts the prophet's context. If, then, Christ's coming is here announced, it may be asked whether his first or his second advent is the object of Daniel's vision. Since the little horn represents the Antichrist, and since Christ is represented as coming only after the destruction of the fourth beast and the little horn, it follows that the second advent must be the object of the prophecy. But here, again, a twofold explanation is possible : Christ's second advent is either his coming for the last judgment (Ippolytus, Eusebius, Theodoret, Kliefoth, Keil, etc. ; cf. Ex. xix. 3 ff.), or it is the exaltation and the triumph of the Son of man, which begins immediately after the destruction of Antichrist, and which will attain the height of its glory in the last judgment. Between the former and the latter event

His garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like clean wool, his throne like flames of fire, the wheels of it like a burning fire. A swift stream of fire issued forth from before him, thousands of thousands ministered to him, and ten thousand times a hundred thousand stood before him: the judgment sat, and the books were opened. I beheld because of the voice of the great words which that horn spoke, and I saw that the beast was slain, and the body thereof was destroyed, and given to the fire to be burned; and that the power of the other beasts was taken away, and that times of life were appointed them for a time, and a time. I beheld therefore in the vision of the night, and lo one<sup>3</sup>

there will, therefore, intervene a period of peace and Christian happiness. It is hardly necessary to note the difference between this fifth kingdom and the four preceding ones: the former were symbolized by beasts, the last one is represented by one like the Son of man; the four preceding ones rise and perish after a while of existence; the fifth has "everlasting power, that shall not be taken away . . . and that shall not be destroyed."

If it is asked whether this explanation does not favor the opinion of the Chiliasts or the Millennists, we may answer with an emphatic denial. All that can be inferred from Daniel is the fifth kingdom's universality and eternity, and its opposition to the four kingdoms preceding it. These characteristics of the fifth kingdom are fully verified in the spiritual kingdom of Christ (cf. Jo. xviii. 36; Luke i. 33), or in the kingdom of the blessed in heaven; or, again, in both taken together. Each of these three opinions has its own adherents among believing commentators, though the third appears to have the most solid claims of probability in its favor. At the time of Christ the Jews expected the coming of the Messianic kingdom (cf. Mark xv. 43; Luke xvii. 20; xix. 11; xxiii. 51); alluding to these hopes both the Baptist and the Lord himself announced that the kingdom of God had come (cf. Matt. iii. 2; iv. 17; xii. 28; Mark i. 17); it is also owing to these expectations that our Lord proposed his parables based on the kingdom, and that the saints are called the citizens of the heavenly kingdom (Rom. i. 7; 1. Cor. i. 2; 1. Pet. ii. 9, etc.). Gabriel too alludes to this hope in the Gospel of Luke i. 33. We are then justified in identifying, at least partially, Daniel's fifth kingdom with Christ's Church on earth. But other passages show that the same kingdom must also be applied to our heavenly home. In Matt. xxv. 34 the saints are after the last judgment invited to take possession of the kingdom prepared for them from the beginning. In the Apocalypse the saints are represented as reigning forever, and the Son of man has inscribed on his thigh, "King of kings and Lord of lords." The saints, or the subjects of the kingdom, are taken from all the different nations and peoples and tongues (cf. Matt. xxiv. 14).

<sup>3</sup> **One like the Son of man.** We need hardly notice the view of Hitzig and Hofmann (*Weissagung und Erfüllung*, i. pp. 209 ff.; *Schriftbeweis*, 1st ed., ii. 2, pp. 541 ff.) that the prophet means merely to give a symbolical representation of "the people of the saints of the Most

like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and he came

High." A personal reference of the prediction to the Messiah must, according to these authors, be excluded. The first reason for this explanation is taken from the context of the prophecy, especially from vv. 18, 22, 27. For there the "saints" are represented as the heirs of the kingdom of God. Then, again, the wording of the prediction suggests the view of the above writers; for the prophet sees "one like the Son of man," as in v. 4, his vision terminated at something like a lion, and in v. 6 at something like a leopard. As therefore the latter visions were merely symbols of the world-monarchies, so must the former be regarded as a mere symbol of the divine kingdom. Thirdly, the judgment is supposed to take place in heaven, where the saints will receive dominion. Hitzig appeals also to Dan. viii. 10, where according to him the nation of saints is to the seer the host of the stars of heaven. According to the same author the basis of Daniel's conception of the Son of man lies in his more developed belief in immortality, and in his supposed identity with David, leading a heavenly life after death (cf. Riehm, pp. 194 ff.).

But it may be urged, on the other hand, that the Book of Enoch (xlv. 1; xlviii. 2 ff.; lxii. 5, 7; lxix. 27, 29) and the Fourth Book of Esdras (xiii. 1 ff.; 12, 32 ff.) refer the passage to a personal Messiah. The same explanation has been found in the testimonies cited for the Messianic character of the prophecy. Then, again, besides merely typical figures the vision represents also persons without any figurative veil; this is especially true of the judgment-scene, in which the description, apart from the beasts in vv. 11 and 12, loses its figurative character. This renders it probable that the "Son of man," who appears in this same scene, is not a mere symbol, but represents a real person. Auberlen has drawn another argument from v. 21, where the saints are distinguished from the "Son of man." For they are persecuted by the little horn, even before the judgment-scene, while the "Son of man" appears only during the judgment. Neither can the saints be said to come "with the clouds of heaven," since this expression commonly implies a divine character of the appearing one. The circumstance that God's judgment-seat is seen in heaven, or that the nation of the saints is to the seer the host of the stars in heaven, does not sufficiently account for the loftiness of the description. The person referred to must be the Messianic king who stands at the head of the saints of the Most High, and is God's representative upon earth. The third Book of the Sibyllines, vv. 286 ff., is right in considering him as sent *ὁὐρανὸθεν ἀπ' ἡελίοιο* (cf. Hilgenfeld, *Jüd. Apokalyptik*, pp. 81 ff.). In him the Messianic kingdom comes from above (Dan. ii. 34 ff., 44 f.), and through him the saints of the Most High receive kingdom and dominion (Dan. vii. 18, 22, 27). This view would be rendered more obscure if it could be proved that in Daniel the conceptions of the Messiah and of the angel of Jehovah are combined, as Hilgenfeld (l. c. pp. 47 ff.) and Öhler (art. *Messias* in *Herzog's Realencyc.* p. 417; *Theol. des A. T.* ii. pp. 144, 265) believe. But strict proof cannot be brought for such an identification, even by appeals to Dan. x. 5 ff., or vii. 13. At best we may compare Dan. with *Ezech. i. 26*, where "demuth *kemar'eh 'ādham*" is used of the the-

even to the Ancient of days, and they presented him before him. And he gave him power and glory and a kingdom ; and all peoples, tribes, and tongues shall serve him ; his power is an everlasting power that shall not be taken away, and his kingdom that shall not be destroyed. My spirit trembled, I Daniel was affrighted at these things, and the visions of my head troubled me.

I went near to one of them that stood by, and asked the truth of him concerning all these things. And he told me the interpretation of the words and instructed me : These four great beasts are four kingdoms, which shall arise out of the earth. But the saints of the most high God shall take the kingdom, and they shall possess the kingdom for ever and ever. After this, I was desirous to be fully instructed concerning the fourth beast, which was very different from all the others, and exceeding terrible : his teeth and claws were of iron, he devoured and broke in pieces, and the rest he stamped upon with his feet : and concerning the ten horns that he had on his head, and concerning the other that came up, before which three horns fell ; and of that horn that had eyes, and a mouth speaking great things, and was greater than the rest. I beheld, and lo that horn made war against the saints, and prevailed over them, till the Ancient of days came and gave judgment to the saints of the Most High, and the time came and the saints obtained the kingdom. And thus he said : The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth, which shall be greater than all the kingdoms, and shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down, and break it in pieces. And the ten horns of the same kingdom shall be ten kings, and another shall rise up after them, and he shall be mightier than the former, and he shall bring down three kings. And he shall speak words against the Most High, and shall crush the saints of the Most High, and he shall think himself able to change times and laws, and they shall be delivered into his hand until a time, and times, and half a time. And judgment shall sit that his power may be taken away, and be broken in pieces, and perish even to the end. And that the kingdom and power and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven may be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all kings shall

ophany. Finally, it is to be noted that the mere figurative symbols of the prophecy are explained by the angel, while no explanation of the Son of man is given, so that he cannot be regarded as a mere symbol (cf. Riehm, "*Messianic Prophecy*," pp. 194 ff.).

serve him, and shall obey him. Hitherto is the end of the word. I Daniel was much troubled with my thoughts, and my countenance was changed in me, but I kept the word in my heart.

#### COROLLARY.

1. It will be found instructive to study the consideration on the Son of man proposed by Baldensperger (*Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*, pp. 169 ff.). Jesus called himself neither "son of David" nor "Christ," but "Son of man." He appears to have intended to break in this manner with the current Messianic ideas of the Synagogue. It has been urged indeed that the term "Son of man" was not at all current among the Jews as a Messianic title, so that Jesus proposed himself to his countrymen as a riddle, or employed the word as a symbol of an esoteric school; or, again, he represented himself by the term as the ideal man, or finally, implied his own humiliation by applying the name to himself. The thesis that the "Son of man" was not connected in the mind of the Jews with the Messiah is inferred from John xii. 34: "The multitude answered him: We have heard out of the law that the Christ abideth for ever; and how sayest thou: The Son of man must be lifted up? Who is this Son of man?" But a moment's reflection shows that this passage identifies the "Son of man" with the Messiah; for it does not imply any doubt as to the meaning of the "Son of man," but expresses surprise at a "Son of man" who does not seem to agree with the current idea of the Messiah.

2. There is another proof for the opinion that "the Son of man" was not connected with the Messiah in the Synagogue. Jesus called himself "the Son of man" very early in his public life, while the disciples did not acknowledge the Messiasship of Jesus till a later period. But this could not have been the case had the name "Son of man" been connected with the Messianic dignity.—This exception is wholly based on a false premise: The first time that Jesus applies the name "Son of man" to himself he speaks to

Nicodemus in the privacy of the night. The next time the name is assumed by Jesus in the beginning of his second year of teaching, after he has cured the man sick of the palsy; here he attributes to the "Son of man" the power to forgive sins. The third time Jesus applies the name to himself about the Passover-feast of his second year of public life, when he attributes to the "Son of man" the power over the Sabbath. After this almost a year elapses before Jesus uses the term again in his Eucharistic discourse. It is therefore quite clear that Jesus does not use the name "Son of man" so early and so frequently in the presence of his disciples that the latter ought to have been, on that account, fully conversant with his Messianic character, even in the earlier part of his public life. The disciples were of slow understanding in the truths pertaining to the person and the office of their master, so that their neglect of his occasional self-imposed name is not at all surprising.

3. On the other hand, it is *a priori* probable that the term "Son of man," as occurring in the teaching of Jesus, is only another instance of dogmatic development of theological ideas that had been current even in the Old Testament. There is first a series of instances in which the term "Son of man" has a meaning similar to that which it has in the books of Daniel and of Enoch (Matt. x. 23; xiii. 41; xvi. 27; xix. 28; xxiv. 27; Acts vii. 56; Apoc. i. 13; xiv. 14; John v. 27). In both series the bearer of the name is represented as the Lord of glory and majesty. Besides all this, Holsten, following the initiative of Usteri, has analyzed the 42 instances in which the term "Son of man" occurs in the synoptic Gospels, and has found that its meaning is identified with that of the Messiah, because all its attributes are contained in or derived from the concept of the Messiah, while they are foreign to the concept of a mere man. Remembering, then, that Jesus did not add merely formal terms to the theological teaching of the Old Testament, it is probable that the term "Son of man" had in the Old Testament the same meaning that he gave it.



4. It follows from all this that we must reject the opinions of a number of scholars touching the value of the name "Son of man." Weisse, e.g., makes the name "an unstamped concept;" Keim, "a name of concealment and of manifestation;" Weizsäcker attributes to the term "an ambiguous profundity;" Weiss finds in the name the designation of "something singular among the children of men." Brückner is right in maintaining that "never and at no time has [the name 'Son of man'] served to conceal and to cover up the Messianic intentions [of Jesus];" it rather served "to manifest the kind of his Messiasship." Usteri has shown that the synthesis of the glorious with the opprobrious attributes given to the "Son of man" is explicable only on the supposition that the name "Son of man" expresses the peculiar Messianic vocation of Jesus.

5. And how can we maintain that Jesus employed the name in an obscure or an ambiguous or an esoteric meaning, seeing that the disciples were not at all afraid to inquire concerning doubtful expressions and phrases? But they never inquired about the meaning of this name. Nor can it be said that the "Son of man" merely signifies the "ideal man," his work consisting in civilizing the human race. For this would be to carry our own manner of thinking and speaking back for over a thousand years, into a period where there was no trace of such language or expression.

6. It follows, then, that Jesus employed this title in speaking of himself, not in order to conceal his person and his mission, but to rectify the current Messianic idea of the times. The names "Christ" and "son of David" carried with them ideas which Jesus did not wish to fulfil, and the accomplishment of which he did not intend to promise. Hence he chooses a name which has not yet been abused in this manner, and in which the glorious and the ignominious attributes of the Messiah are properly tempered, while the name itself connects the person of its bearer unmistakably with the prophetic promises of the Old Testament.

## CHAPTER III.

THE MESSIAS IS THE SAVIOUR. Is. LI. 1-LII. 12; LXII.

## INTRODUCTION.

## 1. CONNECTION OF THE PROPHECIES WITH THE CONTEXT.

—The second great division of the second part of *Isaias* begins with c. *xlvi*. The subject of the whole treatise is described in *Isaias* *xl*. 2: “her iniquity is forgiven,” or “her ransom has been paid.” The first canto treats in general of the second redeemer, the Servant, and of his work, *xlix*. 1-26; in the two following cantos the manner and the effects of the redemption are explained. For *l*. 1-11 shows that the disobedience of *Sion* will be expiated by the obedience of the Servant’s suffering and death; *li*. 1-*lii*. 12 promises, by way of a dialogue, salvation to the people as an effect of its liberation, and stirs up *Sion* to the greatest joy. The fifth canto of the third part in the second great division of *Isaias*, beginning with chapter *lviii*., contains sentiments similar to those contained in the parts just described. After recommending in the first two cantos true internal justice, the prophet goes on recommending to the people the goodly effects of the Messianic reign and their author. Thus it comes to pass that in c. *lxii*. 1-12 he excites the people to a desire after the new *Jerusalem*.

2. THE MESSIANIC CHARACTER OF THESE PASSAGES.—*a*.

Rabbinic testimonies: Rabbi Eleazar says: If *Israel* would repent, they would be redeemed, as it is said, “Return ye backsliding children, and I will heal your backslidings.” Rabbi Joshua said unto him: “Has it not been already

said: 'You were sold for naught, and ye shall be redeemed without money?' You were sold among the idolators; and you shall be redeemed without money, i.e., without repentance and good works" (cf. Is. lii. 3). Talmud, Sanhedrin, fol. 97, col. 2.

Yalkut on Is. lii. 7 has the following exposition: "In the hour when the Holy One, blessed be his name, redeems Israel, three days before Messiah, comes Elias, and stands upon the mountains of Israel and weeps and mourns for them, and says to them, 'Ye mountains of the land of Israel, how long shall you stand in a dry and desolate land?' And his voice is heard from the world's end to the world's end, and after that he says to them: 'Peace has come to the world, peace has come to the world;' as it is said: 'How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings. . . .' And when the wicked hear it, they rejoice and they say, one to another: 'Peace has come to us.' On the second day he shall stand upon the mountains of Israel and shall say: 'Good has come to the world, good has come to the world;' for it is said, 'that bringeth good tidings of good.' On the third day he shall come and stand upon the mountains of Israel, and say: 'Salvation has come to the world, salvation has come to the world;' for it is said, 'that publisheth salvation.' And when he shall see the wicked say so, he will say unto Sion, 'thy God reigneth.'"

b. The text of the passage itself shows its Messianic reference: in li. 4 the prophet announces salvation for all the nations, and that by means of the law and the doctrine. Hence there can be no question here of the liberation through Cyrus. In verse 6 this salvation is represented as everlasting, and therefore must the Saviour mentioned in verse 5 be distinct from Cyrus. The same lasting character of the promised salvation is again inculcated in verse 8, and in verse 14 the liberator must be identified with the Servant of whom there is question in the preceding chapters (xlix. 9; xlii. 7). The address in verse 16 cannot be

directed to any one but the Lord's Servant: it does not fit the people, and an address to the prophet would require too violent and sudden a transition. The new heavens, of which there is question in verse 16, appear to inaugurate those spoken of in lxxv. 17, which latter evidently refer to the Messianic times (cf. Rom. viii. 21; II. Pet. iii. 13). The magnificent promises concerning the new Jerusalem render it impossible to limit c. lxii. to the liberation of the Jews from the Babylonian captivity.

IS. LI. 1—LII. 12.

<sup>1</sup> Give ear to me, you that follow that which is just, and you that seek the Lord; look unto the rock whence you are hewn, and to the hole of the pit from which you are dug out. Look unto Abraham your father, and to Sara that bore you; for I called him all alone, and blessed him, and multiplied him. The Lord therefore will comfort Sion, and will comfort all the ruins thereof, and he will make her desert as a place of pleasure, and her wilderness as the garden of the Lord. Joy and gladness shall be found therein, thanksgiving and the voice of praise. Harken unto me, O my people, and give ear to me, O my tribe, for a law shall go forth from me, and my judgment shall rest to be a light of the nations. My just one is near at hand, my Saviour is gone forth, and my arms shall judge the peoples; the islands shall look for me, and shall patiently wait for my arm. Lift up your eyes to heaven, and look down to the earth beneath, for the heavens shall vanish like smoke, and the earth shall be worn away like a garment, and the inhabitants thereof shall perish in like manner; but my salvation shall be for ever, and my justice shall not fail. Harken to me, you that know what is just, my people who have my law in their heart; fear ye not the reproach of men, and be not afraid of their blasphemies. For the worm shall eat them up

<sup>1</sup> Give ear to me. The prophet is about to describe the glory and the exaltation of the new Jerusalem, in such a manner, however, as to draw attention to the universality of the coming salvation. The pious ones are reminded that as God drew from the seed of Abraham and from the childless Sara the whole Israelite nation, so will he draw forth from the ruins of Sion a universal salvation, which is near and will be everlasting—outlasting even the universe, and being unassailable by any hostile attack.

as a garment, and the moth shall consume them as wool ; but my salvation shall be for ever, and my justice from generation to generation.

Arise, <sup>2</sup> arise, put on strength, O thou arm of the Lord ; arise as in the days of old, in the ancient generations. Hast not thou struck the proud one, and wounded the dragon ? Hast not thou dried up the sea, the water of the mighty deep, who madest the depth of the sea a way, that the delivered might pass over ? And now they that are redeemed by the Lord shall return and shall come into Sion singing praises, and joy everlasting shall be upon their heads ; they shall obtain joy and gladness, sorrow and mourning shall flee away. I, I myself will comfort you ; who art thou that thou shouldst be afraid of a mortal man, and of the son of man, who shall wither away like grass ? And thou hast forgotten the Lord thy maker, who stretched out the heavens, and founded the earth ; and thou hast been afraid continually, all the day, at the presence of his fury who afflicted thee ; where is now the fury of the oppressor ? He shall quickly come that is going to open unto you, and he shall not kill unto utter destruction, neither shall his bread fail. But I am the Lord thy God who trouble the sea, and the waves thereof swell ; the Lord of hosts is my name. I have put my words in thy mouth, and have protected thee in the shadow of my hand, that thou mightest plant the heavens, and found the earth, and mightest say to Sion, thou art my people.

<sup>3</sup> Arise, arise, stand up, O Jerusalem, which hast drunk at the hand of the Lord the cup of his wrath ; thou hast drunk even to the bottom of the cup of dead sleep, and thou hast drunk even to the dregs. There is none that can uphold her among all the

<sup>2</sup> Arise, arise, put on strength. The prophet earnestly implores the divine power, which formerly assisted the Israelites so signally, to effect this salvation. Certain of being heard, he beholds in his mental vision the returning exiles, as they go up to Jerusalem rejoicing and triumphant. And since God himself has taken the defence of his people, why fear the fury and the power of men ? The Saviour God will surely come, will remove all obstacles, and fulfil his promises to restore a new eternal kingdom in the midst of his people.

<sup>3</sup> Arise, arise, stand up. Jerusalem is therefore bid to rise from her lowly and abject condition. It is true, she has experienced the fury and the wrath of the Lord : she has been stricken with a plague which no man can heal, since her sons have been led away captives or have been slain ; but God is about to stay his anger, and to afflict Sion's enemies.

children that she hath brought forth, and there is none that taketh her by the hand among all the children that she hath brought up. There are two things that have happened to thee : who shall be sorry for thee ? desolation and destruction, and famine, and the sword ; who shall comfort thee ? Thy children are cast forth, they have slept at the head of all the ways, as the wild ox that is snared, full of the indignation of the Lord, of the rebuke of thy God. Therefore hear this, thou poor little one, and that art drunk, but not with wine. Thus saith the sovereign the Lord, and thy God, who will fight for his people : Behold, I have taken out of thy hand the cup of dead sleep, the dregs of the cup of my indignation, thou shalt not drink it again any more. And I will put it in the hand of them that have oppressed thee, and have said to thy soul : Bow down that we may go over ; and thou hast laid thy body as the ground, and as a way to them that went over.

Arise,<sup>4</sup> arise, put on thy strength, O Sion, put on the garments of thy glory, O Jerusalem, the city of the Holy One : for henceforth the uncircumcised and the unclean shall no more pass through thee. Shake thyself from the dust, arise, sit up, O Jerusalem ; loose the bonds from off thy neck, O captive daughter of Sion. For thus saith the Lord : You were sold for naught, and you shall be redeemed without money. For thus saith the Lord God : My people went down into Egypt at the beginning to sojourn there : and the Assyrian hath oppressed them without any cause at all. And now what have I here ? saith the Lord, for my people is taken away for naught. They that rule over them treat them unjustly, saith the Lord, and my name is continually blasphemed all the day long. Therefore my people shall know my name in that day ; for I myself that spoke, behold I am here.

How beautiful<sup>5</sup> upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, and that preacheth peace : of him that

<sup>4</sup> **Arise, arise, put on thy strength.** Jerusalem is therefore bidden to exult with the most lively expressions of joy and gladness, because the Lord will be present to his people oppressed by foreign nations, and for the sake of his own glory he will prove himself a Saviour.

<sup>5</sup> **How beautiful upon the mountains.** The glad tidings have already been brought to the city, and rightly do all classes of the nation rejoice over the power of the Lord as manifested before all the world, and over the salvation of the Lord as offered to every one. But in order to share in this salvation, the Israelites must follow the Lord as their leader, who will grant them an honorable return out of the land of exile.



showeth forth good, that preacheth salvation, that saith to Sion : Thy God shall reign ! The voice of thy watchmen : they have lifted up their voice, they shall praise together, for they shall see eye to eye when the Lord shall convert Sion. Rejoice and give praise together, O ye deserts of Jerusalem, for the Lord hath comforted his people, he hath redeemed Jerusalem. The Lord hath prepared his holy arm in the sight of all the Gentiles, and all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God. Depart, depart, go ye out from thence, touch no unclean thing : go out of the midst of her, be ye clean, you that carry the vessels of the Lord. For you shall not go out in a tumult, neither shall you make haste by flight, for the Lord will go before you, and the God of Israel will gather you together.

## IS. LXII.

For <sup>6</sup> Sion's sake, I will not hold my peace, and for the sake of Jerusalem I will not rest, till her just one come forth as brightness, and her Saviour be lighted as a lamp. And the Gentiles shall see thy just one, and all kings thy glorious one ; and thou shalt be called by a new name, which the mouth of the Lord shall name. And thou shalt be a crown of glory in the hand of the Lord, and a royal diadem in the hand of thy God. Thou shalt no more be called " Forsaken," and thy land shall no more be called " Desolate ; " but thou shalt be called " My pleasure in her," and thy land " Inhabited ; " because the Lord hath been well pleased with thee, and thy land shall be inhabited. For the young man shall dwell with the virgin, and thy children shall dwell in thee. And the bridegroom shall rejoice over the bride, and thy God shall rejoice over thee.

Upon <sup>7</sup> thy walls, O Jerusalem, I have appointed watchmen, all

<sup>6</sup> **For Sion's sake, I will not hold my peace.** The more grievously the nation has been oppressed, the greater is the necessity to repeat again and again God's mighty promises of salvation in order to console and to strengthen the afflicted hearts of the multitude. Hence, again, this absolute promise of liberation and the glowing description of the future happy condition of the Jewish people. But all nations will share this great happiness, so that Sion will manifest the glory of God to the whole world, because in Sion will reside God's peace and happiness.

<sup>7</sup> **Upon thy walls, O Jerusalem.** Till this salvation of the people will be accomplished God will grant his children men who will prepare them for their future happiness, and who will be special intercessors

the day and all the night, they shall never hold their peace. You that are mindful of the Lord hold not your peace, and give him no silence till he establish, and till he make Jerusalem a praise in the earth. The Lord hath sworn by his right hand, and by the arm of his strength : Surely I will no more give thy corn to be meat for thy enemies, and the sons of the strangers shall not drink thy wine, for which thou hast labored. For they that gather it shall eat it and shall praise the Lord ; and that bring it together shall drink it in my holy courts. Go through, go through the gates, prepare the way for the people, make the road plain, pick out the stones, and lift up the standard to the peoples. Behold the Lord hath made it to be heard in the ends of the earth, tell the daughter of Sion : Behold thy Saviour cometh ; behold his reward is with him, and his work before him. And they shall call them, " The holy people, the redeemed of the Lord ! " But thou shalt be called : " A city Sought after, and not Forsaken. "

#### COROLLARY.

Though the Jews may have identified at first the salvation promised by Isaiah with that from the Babylonian captivity, they must have seen after their return that these promises regarded a still future Messianic age.

in their behalf before the divine majesty. Besides, God promises perfect safety and fertility of the land, and he invites all to share in Sion's salvation, and to make common cause with the holy people of God (cf. Knabenb., in loc.).

## CHAPTER IV.

THE MESSIAS WILL BE THE ANGEL OF THE TESTAMENT. MAL. II. 17—III. 6.

### INTRODUCTION.

**THE MESSIANIC CHARACTER OF THE PROPHECY.**—The reference of the prophecy to the Messiah may be derived from the meaning of three expressions: "Angel of the Testament," "the Lord," and "my Angel."

1. The Phrase "my Angel" denotes John the Baptist. — The expression is an allusion to, or repetition of, Is. xl. 3; the people had complained (Mal. ii. 17) that the Messianic promises had not been accomplished. Hence Malachias had the best of reasons to repeat Isaiah's prophecy, thus showing that it would surely be fulfilled in its own good time. The expression "he shall prepare the way before my face" repeats the prediction of Is. xl. 3; lvii. 14; lxii. 10, in which passages there is question of the preparation of the way for the coming Messiah. Hengstenberg, Eichhorn, Theiner, and a few others are of opinion that this "angel" denotes a series of persons who must prepare the way for the Messiah. But the context of the prophecy seems to require that the coming of the "angel" is a chronological sign of the approaching Messiah. If there were question of a series of "angels," they could not furnish such a chronological determination. Whether this herald sent to prepare the Messiah's way will be an angel as in Ex. xxxiii. 1, or mere man, cannot be determined with certainty from the words of the text. But starting from the analogy between the present passage and Mal. iv. 5, it becomes

probable that the preparing angel is a man; this probability increases still more if we consider that the Messiah himself will be a man (cf. Is. vii. 14; Jer. xxxi. 22; Mich. v. 2). For us Christians it has been determined in the New Testament that the preparing angel is a man, and none other than John the Baptist (cf. Matt. iii. 3; xi. 10; Mark i. 2; Luke i. 17; iii. 4). The opinion (Barh.) that the angel literally refers to St. Michael (cf. Dan. xii. 1), and typically to John the Baptist, is not only against the context of the prophecy, but also against the unanimous testimony of the Fathers, who regard the passage as referring to John the Baptist (cf. Kilber, *Analysis Biblica*, ed. II. i. 525). Reinke gives the Jewish opinion about the Messiah the son of Joseph, and about the devastating angel who will destroy all the people's enemies (Reinke, *Mal.* p. 455). There can be no doubt as to the fact that Jewish tradition considered the "angel" as preparatory to the Messiah; for Pirque de R. Eliezer, c. 29, refers *Mal.* iii. 1 to Elias as preparing the way for the Messiah. In *Bemidbar R.* 17 (ed. Warsh. p. 69, *a.*) *Mal.* iii. 4 seems to be applied to the acceptable sacrifices in the Messianic days. On *Mal.* iii. 16 *Vayyikra R.* 34 (ed. Warsh. p. 51, *b.* line 4 from the bottom) has the following comment: "If any one in former times did the commandment, the prophets wrote it down. But now, when a man observes the commandment, who writes it down? Elias and the king Messiah and the Holy One, blessed be his name, seal it at their hands, and a memorial book is written, as it is written *Mal.* iii. 16." The promise of the following verse 17 is also extended to Messianic days in *Shemoth R.* 18. According to the tradition of the Synagogue, therefore, the prediction evidently has a Messianic meaning. And even the Jews might have inferred from this that the "angel" would be a man sent to prepare the Messiah's way.

2. **The Lord is Jehovah himself.**—*a.* The Hebrew word *Adon* with the definite article occurs only seven times besides *Mal.* iii. 1 in the Old Testament. But in all these instances

it means Jehovah himself (cf. Ex. xxiii. 17; xxxiv. 23; Is. i. 24; iii. 1; x. 16; x. 33; xix. 4). Hence it must mean Jehovah in our passage too. *b.* The same conclusion follows from the context; for the speaker is "the Lord of hosts." Now the speaker is also he that will come; for "he shall prepare the way before *my* face." Hence the very Lord of hosts will be the Lord "whom you seek," and who will come. *c.* Again, "the Lord . . . shall come to *his* temple." But the temple belongs to Jehovah. Hence the Lord who shall come must be Jehovah. The accuracy of the rendering "temple" follows from the circumstance that the Hebrew word "hechal" signifies "temple" fifty-eight times, while it means "palace" only five times (III. Kings xxi. 1; IV. Kings xx. 18; Ps. x. (xi.) 5; Is. xxxix. 7; Dan. i. 4; cf. Corny, Spicil. i. p. 526). Besides, at the time of Malachias, the royal palace existed no longer, so that "hechal" naturally signified "temple" only. Then, the Lord who comes shall purify the temple, and reform its ministers, so that he must be understood to come into the temple. Finally, Malachias appears to allude to the promise of Aggeus ii. 9, where the future glory of the temple is described as being derived from the presence of the Messiah in it. Hence, on this account, too, "the Lord" here spoken of must denote Jehovah.

**3. The Angel of the Testament is the Messiah.**—*a.* The difference between "the Angel of the Testament" and "the Angel who is to prepare the way" is plain from the following circumstances: the latter prepares the way, the former comes to his temple; the Angel of the Testament is he "whom you desire" (Is. xlii. 6; Heb. xii. 24; viii. 6), while the preparatory angel cannot be identified with this latter. *b.* The "Angel of the Testament" is identical with "the Lord," Jehovah, as appears from the parallelism of the two clauses. *c.* The same identity is strictly maintained throughout the Old Testament (Ex. xxiii. 20, 21; Is. lxiii. 9; Jos. v. 13-16; vi. 2; Ex. iii. 2; iii. 4, 5; Gen. xxviii. 11-22; cf. Os. xii. 4; Gen. xxxii. 28-30; cf. Os. xii. 4). *d.*

The name "Angel of the Testament" accurately expresses the office of the promised Messiah. For according to a Lapide and Tirinus the expression signifies the legate or the mediator of the covenant; while Albertus and Sanchez consider it as equivalent to the herald of the covenant, its instructor and fulfiller. Now all the patriarchal promises are to have their accomplishment in the Messiah; in the Messiah the new covenant promised to the patriarchs is to be established, and all the nations of the earth are to be blessed through the Messiah. Hence the Messiah and the Angel of the Testament are co-extensive and therefore identical terms (cf. Is. xlii. 6; xlix. 8; lv. 3; liv. 10; lix. 21; lxi. 8; Jer. xxxi. 31; xxxii. 40; xxxiii. 20; Ezech. xvi. 60; xxxiv. 25; Dan. ix. 25; Os. ii. 18). This argument may be confirmed by the circumstance that St. Paul (Heb. ix. 15) calls Christ the mediator of the New Testament. *c.* Finally, the context of our prophecy requires that the Angel of the Testament should be identified with the Messiah. The prophet, it must be remembered, consoles the people disheartened on account of the non-fulfilment of the Messianic promises. What better motive of consolation, then, could Malachias offer to the discontented multitude than the identical promises of the future Messiah, about the non-fulfilment of which they were complaining?

## MAL. II. 17—III. 6.

<sup>1</sup> You have wearied the Lord with your words, and you said: Wherein have we wearied him? In that you say: Every one that

<sup>1</sup> **You have wearied the Lord.** The Hebrew prophets had spoken in such a manner of the liberation from the Babylonian captivity that the Hebrews either identified that event with the Messianic time or expected the Messiah immediately after their return into Palestine. Such is the description of the nation's happiness in Ezechiel (xxxvi. 10, 15, 29, 35; xxxvii. 14, 22); such the picture of the new Jerusalem drawn by Isaias (xlix. 17; liv. 1 ff.), Jeremiah (xxxiii. 7 f.; xxxi. 38; xxxii. 26 f.), and Zacharias (ii. 2 f.). When the returning Jews were overwhelmed with affliction rather than with blessing (Esd. iii. 12; iv. 4 f.; Neh. i. 3 f.; ii. 19; v. 2 f.; Agg. i. 6; ii. 17), so that even



doth evil is good in the sight of the Lord, and such please him ; or else where is the God of judgment ? Behold, I send my Angel, and he shall prepare the way before my face. And presently the Lord whom you seek, and the Angel of the Testament whom you desire, shall come to his temple. Behold, he cometh, saith the Lord of hosts, and who<sup>2</sup> shall be able to think of the day of his coming ? and who shall stand to see him ? for he is like a refining fire and like the fuller's herb. And he shall sit refining and cleansing the silver, and he shall<sup>3</sup> purify the sons of Levi, and

after the restoration of city and sanctuary they lived in poverty and under a foreign rule (Mal. i. 7, 13), they had, naturally speaking, sufficient reason to complain about the apparent falsehood of their prophetic promises. On the other hand, the complaint of the people shows a want of confidence and faith in God's word, so that the Lord rightly expresses his weariness at the sight of their fickleness. The prophet promises exactly those good things over the delay of which his fellow-citizens were so uneasy ; hence he uses the expressions, " The Lord whom you seek " and " the Angel of the Testament whom you desire."

<sup>2</sup> **Who shall be able.** The prophet here adds a consideration well calculated to stay the murmurings of the discontented multitude. The prophetic predictions will be fulfilled indeed, but the Messiah will also come in the capacity of judge (Is. iv. 4 ; Ezech. xxxiv. 20 ; Zach. xiii. 9). Let not then the Jews' confidence be placed in the Messiah's help, unless they are really and internally prepared for his coming. It may be noted here that the prophets do not always describe the Messiah according to all his attributes ; the circumstance that he is described as a severe judge in this passage does not contradict the predictions in which he is exhibited as the Good Shepherd and as the Great Consoler.

<sup>3</sup> **He shall purify the sons of Levi.** The Messianic judgment will begin in the temple, and affect all those details which appertain to the divine service. For the temple is God's own house, and the priests are his special ministers. Any blemish of the temple, and any blame attaching to the priesthood, must therefore be especially detestable in the sight of God. In the words of the fourth verse, we have a confirmation of the argument for the perpetual sacrifice of the New Law, based on Mal. i. 11. But though the Messiah will begin his judgment with the priesthood and the temple, he will not confine himself to them. " And I will come to you in judgment," he addresses the common people, " and will be speedy witness against sorcerers, and adulterers, and false swearers, and them that oppress the hireling in his wages, the widows and the fatherless." Here the prophet enumerates those criminal practices that are especially hateful to God, and for which he will visit the guilty in a most severe manner. Finally, the prophet ends with a new argument for the certainty of the Messianic promises, whether consoling or terrifying, appealing to the immutability of God, by reason of which his word cannot be changed by any power.

shall refine them as gold, and as silver, and they shall offer sacrifices to the Lord in justice. And the sacrifice of Juda and of Jerusalem shall please the Lord, as in the days of old, and in the ancient years. And I will come to you in judgment, and will be a speedy witness against sorcerers, and adulterers and false swearers, and them that oppress the hireling in his wages, the widows and the fatherless, and oppress the stranger and have not feared me, saith the Lord of hosts. For I am the Lord, and I change not, and you the sons of Jacob are not consumed.

### COROLLARIES.

1. From this prophecy it follows that the Messiah will be identical with Jehovah, since the Angel of the Testament is identical with the Lord. The Messiah's divinity had been predicted in other prophecies : Ps. ii.; Is. ix. 6; Ps. xlv. 7; Ps. cix. 1, 3; Zach. xii. 10. But Malachias speaks so clearly that all doubt must vanish.

2. The predictions of this prophecy must be understood partly literally, i.e., in the proper sense of the prophetic words, partly metaphorically. The Messiah will literally come to the temple, but he will purify the sons of Levi in a metaphorical sense, instituting a new priesthood, which is typically represented by the Levites of the Old Testament. See, however, Jo. iv. 13 f.

3. The prophecy may be used as an argument against the Jews, because several of their own commentators have admitted its Messianic character (Abarbanel, Kimchi, Saadiah, Aben-Ezra). But at the same time they must admit that the temple has long ceased to exist. Hence the Messiah must have come.

4. We need not mention the fact that the argument for the Eucharistic sacrifice may be confirmed by what is said concerning the sacrifices instituted by the Messiah.

5. Corluy and Pusey are of opinion that the prophet has blended in this prediction the first and the second advent of the Messiah. The first coming appears in the light of

pure mercy rather than of justice and judgment. This is confirmed by the words of Christ himself (Jo. iii. 17), who did not come to judge the world, but to save it. Hence the threats of Malachias' prophecy seem to belong to Christ's second advent.

## CHAPTER V.

THE MESSIAS IS THE SERVANT OF THE LORD. *Is. xlix.*-1.

## INTRODUCTION.

**1. IDENTITY OF JEHOVAH'S SERVANT.**—1. In *Deut. x. 12* it is said: "And now, Israel, what doth the Lord thy God require of thee, but that thou fear the Lord thy God, and walk in his ways, and love him, and serve the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul?" And in verse 20 of the same chapter the law-giver again insists on the same obligation: "Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and serve him only; to him thou shalt adhere, and shalt swear by his name." We cannot then be astonished if the Lord says, *Lev. xxv. 55*: "unto me the children of Israel are servants" (cf. *Ps. cv. 6*, etc.). But single persons too are honored with the title "servant of the Lord" in the earlier books of the Old Testament: Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in *Deut. ix. 27*, etc.; Moses in *Jos. i. 1*, and frequently throughout the course of the book; David in *IV. Kings viii. 66*, etc. It is, however, noticeable that the name throughout is a name of honor and respect rather than of subjection and servitude.

2. Coming now to the writings of *Isaias xli.-liii.*, the title "servant of the Lord" occurs nineteen times: In *xli. 8, 9*; *xliv. 1, 2, 21 (bis)*; *xlv. 4* and *xlvi. 20* it appears to apply to either Jacob or Israel; in *xlii. 19 (bis)*; *xlvi. 10*; *xlv. 26* the application of the title is doubtful; in *xlii. 1*; *xlix. 3, 5, 6*; *l. 10*; *li. 13*; *liii. 11* the term denotes a person

who represents Israel, and who is at the same time distinct from Israel (cf. Kay, *Is.* p. 233).

3. The mission of Jehovah's servant is represented as twofold: *a.* He must teach the world the true religion; *b.* he is to be Israel's mediator, and to bring about the nation's restoration. Since he completes these two offices in c. liii. 11, "by his knowledge shall this my just servant justify many, and he shall bear their iniquities," he is no longer spoken of after c. liii.; but instead of him we find "servants of the Lord" in chapters liv.–lxvi., an expression which does not occur in the earlier parts of the prophecies. Isaias introduces these "servants of the Lord" as often as ten times: liv. 17; lvi. 6; lxiii. 17; lxv. 9; lxv. 13 (bis); lxv. 14 (bis); lxv. 15; lxvi. 14. These servants appear to be the fulfilment of the promise in liii. 10: "If he shall lay down his life for sin, he shall see a long-lived seed, and the will of the Lord shall be prosperous in his hand." The apostle (Rom. v. 15–19) seems to have alluded to this prophetic passage, where he tells us that many have been justified through the obedience of one.

4. Returning now to the passage in which we maintain that the Messiah is identified with the "servant of the Lord," we find that *Is.* xlix. 1–13 describes the person and the experiences of the servant, and also his double mission; vv. 14–26 contain an answer to the difficulties against the prophet's position—difficulties which arise out of the unbelief of Israel; l. 1–3 states Israel's rejection on account of its sins; l. 4–9 treats of the manner in which the servant will fulfil his mission, and speaks even of his passion; l. 10 f. exhorts the Jews to place their confidence in the servant; those who will not believe in him will surely perish.

## 2. MESSIANIC CHARACTER OF THE SERVANT OF THE LORD.

—*a.* That the servant of the Lord is the Messiah follows in the first place from his having the work of the Messiah to do. For the Messianic predictions generally assign the twofold mission which Isaias imposes on the Lord's servant to the Messiah himself. *b.* The identity of the Mes-

sias with the "servant of the Lord" appears also from several passages of the New Testament. Matt. i. 21 and Luke i. 31, e.g., describe the child which is about to be born as having the offices which are attributed to the Lord's servant in the chapters of the prophet Isaias. *c.* The patristic testimonies in favor of the servant's identity with the Messiah may be seen in Kilber's *Analysis Biblica*, ed. Tailhan, i. p. 380. *d.* Finally, we have the Rabbinic tradition for the servant's identity with the Messiah. The Targum on xlii. 1 reads: "Behold my servant, the Messiah, I will bring him near." The same authority renders Is. xliii. 10: "And my servant, the Messiah, in whom I am well pleased." The same testimony favors the Messianic bearing of Is. lii. 13: "Behold, my servant, the Messiah, shall prosper; he shall be exalted." And concerning the words "my servant shall deal prudently," the same Targum adds: "This is the king Messiah." Besides these passages, we may refer to the Midrash on Ps. ii.; Yalkut ii., p. 104 *d.*; p. 52 *b.*; Midrash on Prov. xix. 21; and in general to all those testimonies in which the context of passages that refer to the servant is interpreted Messianically (cf. Corny, *Spicil.* ii. 86).

**3. ANTI-CHRISTIAN EXPLANATIONS.**—*a.* The servant is Moses, or Ezechias, or David, or Ozias, or Jeremias, or Isaias, or Josias. But none of these persons satisfies all the conditions that are required by the words of the prophecy. They suffered for their own sins (David, Ozias), or they were not of humble birth (Ezechias, Josias, Isaias), or they did not offer their sufferings for the good of the people (Jeremias, Isaias, David, Ezechias), or they had not long-lived seed (Moses), or they were not condemned to an unjust death (Moses, David, etc.).

*b.* The servant is the entire people of Israel, or its better part, or the series of the prophets, or the priestly order. *a.* But it is false that the whole nation suffered unjustly, and that the just ones of the nation suffered for the ungodly, since during the Captivity many of the holy men



were treated better than their fellow-citizens.  $\beta$ . Sacred Scripture contains no vestige of any vicarious suffering on the part of the people, or of its better part, or of any special class of the nation.  $\gamma$ . The whole context shows that the prophet's words must be understood of an individual servant, so that no moral person can be thought of.  $\delta$ . It is false that the servant always signifies the same person, or collection of persons, wherever the expression occurs. Hence the very foundation of the opponents' theory is not solid.

IS. XLIX.—L.

<sup>1</sup> Give ear, ye islands, and hearken, ye peoples from afar. The Lord hath called me from the womb, from the bowels of my mother he hath been mindful of my name. And he hath made my mouth like a sharp sword; in the shadow of his hand he hath protected me, and hath made me as a chosen arrow; in his quiver he hath hidden me. And he said to me: Thou art my servant, Israel, for in thee will I glory. And I said: I have labored in vain; therefore my judgment is with the Lord, and my work with my God. And now, saith the Lord that formed me from the womb to be his servant, that I may bring back Jacob unto him, and Israel will not be gathered together; and I am glorified in the eyes of the Lord, and my God is my strength. And he said: Is it a small thing that thou shouldst be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to convert the dregs of Israel? Behold, I have given thee to be the light of the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation even to the farthest part of the earth. Thus saith the Lord the Redeemer of Israel, his Holy One, to the soul that is despised, to the nation that is abhorred, to the servant of rulers: Kings shall see

<sup>1</sup> Give ear, ye islands. The servant of the Lord tells the assembled nations how he has been chosen and instructed by God to fulfil his work, but he complains at the same time that he has labored in vain; therefore he intrusts his cause entirely to God's judgment. God consoles his servant by showing him the fruit of his labor, by means of which salvation will come to the world, but in such a manner that the servant himself will be glorified through his great humiliations. At the time of his sorest need the Lord will assist him in his might, will restore his scattered inheritance, bring back the people of Israel out of captivity, and from all parts of the earth will those come together who will extol the servant's praises.

and princes shall rise up, and adore for the Lord's sake, because he is faithful, and for the Holy One of Israel who hath chosen thee. Thus saith the Lord : In an acceptable time I have heard thee, and in the day of salvation I have helped thee ; and I have preserved thee, and given thee to be a covenant of the people, that thou mightest raise up the earth, and possess the inheritances that were destroyed ; that thou mightest say to them that are bound, Come forth, and to them that are in darkness, Show yourselves. They shall feed in the ways, and their pastures shall be in every plain. They shall not hunger, nor thirst, neither shall the heat nor the sun strike them ; for he that is merciful to them shall be their shepherd, and at the fountains of waters he shall give them drink. And I will make all my mountains a way, and my paths shall be exalted. Behold these shall come from afar, and behold these from the north and from the sea, and these from the south country. Give praise, O ye heavens, and rejoice O earth, ye mountains give praise with jubilation ; because the Lord hath comforted his people, and will have mercy on his poor ones.

And <sup>2</sup> Sion said : The Lord hath forsaken me, and the Lord hath forgotten me. Can a woman forget her infant, so as not to have pity on the son of her womb ? and if she should forget, yet will I not forget thee. Behold, I have graven thee in my hands ; thy walls are always before my eyes. Thy builders are come ; they that destroy thee and make thee waste shall go out of thee. Lift up thy eyes round about, and see, all these are gathered together, they are come to thee : as I live, saith the Lord, thou shalt be clothed with all these as with an ornament, and as a bride thou shalt put them about thee. For thy deserts and thy desolate places and the land of thy destruction shall now be too narrow by reason of the inhabitants, and they that swallowed thee up shall be chased far away. The children of thy barrenness shall still say in thy ears : The place is too strait for me, make me room to dwell in. And thou shalt say in thy heart : Who hath begotten these ? I was barren, and brought not forth, led away and captive ; and who hath brought up these ? I was destitute and alone,

<sup>2</sup> **And Sion said** God consoles Sion, who complains of her desolation, and he predicts that she will become the mother of an innumerable offspring, to her own great surprise and consolation. For God will command the Gentiles to revere Sion with the greatest possible respect, and to bring sons to her ; as a mighty hero he will take the booty from her enemies, chastising them with the severest punishments, and proving himself to be the Redeemer of his own.

and these, where were they? Thus saith the Lord God: Behold, I will lift up my hand to the Gentiles, and will set up my standard to the peoples. And they shall bring thy sons in their arms, and carry thy daughters upon their shoulders. And kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and queens thy nurses; they shall worship thee with their face toward the earth, and they shall lick up the dust of thy feet. And thou shalt know that I am the Lord, for they shall not be confounded that wait for him. Shall the prey be taken from the strong? or can that which was taken by the mighty be delivered? For thus saith the Lord: Yea verily, even the captivity shall be taken away from the strong; and that which was taken by the mighty shall be delivered. But I will judge those that have judged thee, and thy children I will save. And I will feed thy own enemies with their own flesh; and they shall be made drunk with their own blood, as with new wine, and all flesh shall know that I am the Lord that save thee, and thy redeemer, the mighty one of Jacob.

Thus<sup>3</sup> saith the Lord: What is this bill of the divorce of your mother, with which I have put her away? or who is my creditor to whom I sold you? Behold, you are sold for your iniquities, and for your wicked deeds have I put your mother away. Because I came, and there was not a man; I called, and there was none that would hear; is my hand shortened and become little that I cannot redeem? or is there no strength in me to deliver? Behold at my rebuke I will make the sea a desert, I will turn the rivers into dry land; the fishes shall rot for want of water, and shall die for thirst. I will clothe the heavens with darkness, and will make sackcloth their covering.

The<sup>4</sup> Lord hath given me a learned tongue, that I should know how to uphold by word him that is weary; he wakeneth in the morning, in the morning he wakeneth my ear, that I may hear him as a master. The Lord God hath opened my ear, and I do not resist; I have not gone back. I have given my body to the

<sup>3</sup> Thus saith the Lord. The people have been sold into bondage, not owing to God's injustice or weakness, but by reason of their own iniquity; for they have disobeyed the Lord, who alone has the power to save.

<sup>4</sup> The Lord hath given me a learned tongue. The Lord's servant loudly professes his obedience and submission; he calls attention to his patience in the greatest trials, in the midst of which he remains sure of the divine help, and he contrasts all this with the behavior of the people.

strikers and my cheeks to them that plucked them ; I have not turned away my face from them that rebuked me, and spit upon me. The Lord God is my helper, therefore am I not confounded ; therefore have I set my face as a most hard rock, and I know that I shall not be confounded. He is near that justifieth me, who will contend with me ? let us stand together, who is my adversary ? let him come near to me. Behold, the Lord is my helper ; who is he that shall condemn me ? Lo they shall all be destroyed as a garment, the moth shall eat them up.

Who <sup>5</sup> is there among you that feareth the Lord, that heareth the voice of his servant ? let him that hath walked in darkness, and hath no light, hope in the name of the Lord, and lean upon his God. Behold all you that kindle a fire, that are encompassed with flames, walk in the light of your fire, and in the flames which you have kindled ; this is done to you by my hand, you shall sleep in sorrows.

#### COROLLARY.

It appears from all this that the Jews knew and recognized a suffering Messias. And since the latter attained to the greatest glory by means of his sufferings, his identity with the glorious Messias was obvious.

<sup>5</sup> **Who is there among you that feareth the Lord ?** Sure of his final victory and of God's assistance, the servant challenges his enemies to a contest. All those who obey his commands shall obtain great success, while all those who are refractory and disobedient will be given over to ruin and destruction in the flames.

## CHAPTER VI.

THE MESSIAS WILL BE THE EMMANUEL. Is. viii. 1-10.

### INTRODUCTION.

#### 1. CONNECTION OF THE PROPHECY WITH ITS CONTEXT.

—In the eighth chapter Isaias repeats the threats and promises of the seventh. Instead of giving a far-off supernatural sign in confirmation of his predictions regarding Samaria and Syria, he appeals to a present proof for his words. Juda's destruction too is foretold for the second time, but hope is held out through the influence of the Messiah, or the Emmanuel.

**2. ERRONEOUS EXPLANATIONS.**—We need not here repeat the opinion of those authors who identify the Emmanuel of Is. vii. 14 with Maher-Shalal, of whom the prophet speaks in the present passage. This view has been fully refuted in the chapter on Is. vii. 1-17. But we must mention a few of the various aspects under which the theory has been proposed: *a.* The Holy Ghost is the prophetess (cf. Jerome, Haimo); *b.* the virgin-mother is called the prophetess, and Isaias merely witnesses the conception and the birth of Emmanuel (Sasbont, Pinto); *c.* God himself speaks in the person of the prophet and foretells the mystery of the incarnation through the special intervention of the Holy Ghost (Eusebius, Cyril); *d.* Emmanuel is called Maher-Shalal, because he will despoil the devil of his booty, and the king of Damascus shall be vanquished not only before Maher-Shalal will be able to speak, but also through the power of the child (Theod., Basil, Procopius, Osorio, Menochius, Gordon, Barheb.). But on the other hand, a

great number of commentators distinguish between Maher-Shalal and Emmanuel (Thomas, Richard Viet., Sixtus Senensis, Arias, Vatable, Clarius, Maldonatus, Malvenda, Pagninus, Foreiro, Sa, Estius, Mariana, Tirinus, Sanchez, etc.).

**3. MESSIANIC CHARACTER OF THE PROPHECY.**—The Messianic nature of the Emmanuel mentioned in the eighth chapter appears: *a.* From the parallelism between him and the Emmanuel of chapters vii., ix., xi., and Mich. v. 2 f. *b.* Jewish tradition too has interpreted the passage in a Messianic sense: The Talmud (Sanhedrin, fol. 38, col. 1) has the following on viii. 14: "Jehudah and Hezekiah, the sons of Rabbi Hiyah, were sitting at a meal, in the presence of Rabbi, without uttering a word. Give some wine to the boys, exclaimed Rabbi, that they may feel encouraged to say something. When they had drunk the wine, they opened their mouths and said: The son of David will not come until the two patriarchal houses of Israel shall cease—that is, the Head of the captivity in Babylon, and the Prince in the land of Israel; for it is said: 'And he shall be for a sanctuary.' My children, exclaimed the Rabbi, you are thrusting thorns into my eyes. Said Rabbi Hiyah: Rabbi, take it not ill of them; wine is given with seventy, and so is a secret; when the wine comes in, the secret goes out." (Both the word "wine," *yayin*, and the word "sod," secret, have in Hebrew the numerical value of seventy).

#### Is. VIII. 1-10.

<sup>1</sup> And the Lord said to me: Take thee a great book, and write in it with a man's pen: Take away the spoils with speed, quickly

<sup>1</sup> And the Lord said to me. The prophet does not tell us at what precise time this divine command reached him. But judging from the context, it cannot have been long after the sign of the seventh chapter was given to Achaz. The "man's pen" signifies that every one must be able to read the writing (Maldon.), or that the style of the writing must be clear (Mariana, Thomas, Pinto, Foreiro, Malvenda, Menochius, Tirinus, Chaldee version), or that the letters are to be extraordinarily large (Calmet), or that the prophet is to write in the



take the prey. And I took unto me faithful witnesses, Urias the priest, and Zacharias the son of Barachias: and I went to the prophetess, and she conceived and bore a son. And the Lord said to me: Call his name, Hasten to take away the spoils, make haste to take the prey. For before the child know to call his father and his mother, the strength of Damascus and the spoils of Samaria shall be taken away before the king of the Assyrians.

And the <sup>2</sup> Lord spoke to me again, saying: Forasmuch as this people hath cast away the waters of Siloe, that go with silence, and hath rather taken Rasin, and the son of Romelia, therefore behold, the Lord will bring upon them the waters of the river strong and many, the king of the Assyrians and all his glory; and he shall come up over all his channels, and shall overflow all his banks, and shall pass through Juda, overflowing, and going over shall reach even to the neck. And the stretching out of his wings shall fill the breadth of thy land, O Emmanuel. Gather yourselves together, O ye people, and be overcome, and give ear, all ye

common demotic, not in the hieratic characters (Rohling, Trochon). We cannot here examine all the reasons advanced for and against these several explanations. The words of the following verse, "and I took unto me . . .," must be understood as a continuation of God's own address to the prophet. For though the latter does not expressly state that he complied with the divine command, this obedience is understood. As to the prophetess, she is called by this name according to some because she was the prophet's wife. But it appears probable that she herself was endowed with the prophetic gift. Father, mother, and child are here entirely different from the father, mother, and child who are supposed to constitute the sign in the preceding chapter.

<sup>2</sup> And the Lord spoke to me again. But while the prophet confirms by this new sign his predictions concerning the destruction of Samaria and Syria, he also inculcates anew the prophecy concerning the future chastisement of Juda, tempering his prediction, however, with the consoling assurance of final liberation, which is to come to Juda on account of Emmanuel. First the prophet describes the cause of the chastisement: Israel has despised the waters of Siloe which flow softly, i.e., has thrown off the yoke of the royal house of David, and has preferred the kings of Syria and Samaria instead, even as the king Achaz preferred the Assyrian alliance to the help of Jehovah. Hence the Lord will bring on them waters which do not go with silence, and which shall inundate all the country even to the neck, i.e., even to the royal city of Jerusalem. Still, all human power and all human strength shall not be able to prevail against the divine power of the Emmanuel (God with us). Hence the prophet insists so emphatically on the fact that all the enemies' devices shall be vain, as they are directed against the economy of the Emmanuel.

lands afar off ; strengthen yourselves and be overcome, gird yourselves and be overcome. Take counsel together, and it shall be defeated ; speak a word, and it shall not be done, because God is with us.

#### COROLLARIES.

1. The land of Emmanuel is identified with the land of Juda, i.e., with the Lord's own land. Hence Emmanuel must be a specially appointed divine king.

2. The land of Juda shall be saved through, or on account of, Emmanuel, so that Emmanuel himself is represented as the Redeemer of his native land. These characteristics of Lord and Redeemer are, however, more clearly indicated in other prophecies as belonging peculiarly to the Messiah.

## CHAPTER VII.

THE MESSIAS IS THE PRINCE OF PEACE. Is. ix. 1-7.

### INTRODUCTION.

#### 1. CONNECTION OF THE PROPHECY WITH ITS CONTEXT.—

In the seventh chapter the prophet Isaias had predicted the fate of Syria, of Samaria, and of Juda, confirming his prophecy by the celebrated sign of the virgin-mother. In the eighth chapter the prophet first again confirms his prediction by a more immediate sign, and announces salvation as coming through the Emmanuel alone (viii. 1-10). In the second part of the same chapter Isaias shows the practical lessons to be learned from his prophecies for the immediate future: the God-fearing must place all their confidence and hope in God's special protection and help; the wicked will meet with instant ruin and destruction (viii. 11-22). But after these dark times of punishment and affliction, there will come days of boundless joy and gladness; for Emmanuel, the Messianic king and ruler, will be born, and bring universal peace and happiness (ix. 1-7).

**2. UNCHRISTIAN EXPLANATION OF THE PROPHECY.**—The child of whom the prophet speaks is Ezechias. Though the Jewish writers who lived after the time of Christ and several modern Rationalists give this explanation (Gesenius, Hendewerk, Aben-Ezra, Sanhedrin, etc.), the reasons of the former are different from those of the latter: *a.* The former writers base their position on the peculiar rendering of Is. ix. 6; instead of translating "his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, God, the Mighty, the Father of the

world to come, the Prince of peace," they render, "and the Wonderful, the Counsellor, God, the Mighty, the Father of the world to come shall call his name Prince of peace." *b.* The Rationalists assign the following reasons for their opinion: 1. The child is represented by the prophet as already born at the time of the prediction. Now, from what we know of Ezechias, he might well be called a child at that very time (cf. Gen. iv. 23; III. Kings xii. 8; II. Par. x. 8; Eccl. iv. 13). 2. Oriental writers are accustomed to call their kings "gods" by way of hyperbole. Instances of this custom are found in Ps. ii. and in the letter of the Persian to the Armenian king. 3. The expression, "God, the Mighty," does not necessarily imply true divinity; and, what is more, at the time of Isaias the Messianic idea was not yet sufficiently evolved to include divinity in its strict sense. 4. In a wider sense we find that at Isaias' time men were frequently called gods (cf. Ps. lxxxi. (lxxxii.) 1; Jo. x. 34). 5. The very name of Ezechias fully agrees with all the attributes applied to that king by Isaias; for Ezechias signifies "the strength of God."

But, on the other hand, Ezechias cannot be intended by Isaias. For the child must be the cause of the joy for Galilee and the Northern Kingdom. Now, Galilee was never under Ezechias' sway. Again, the peace and joy predicted as future under the child was never realized during the lifetime of Ezechias. Ezechias cannot even by way of hyperbole be called "Mighty God," since he never did anything to justify that magnificent title. And what can be the meaning of the expression "Father of the world to come," as applied to the king Ezechias?

When we come to examine the reasons advanced by the one and the other of the above opponents, we find that none of them is solid enough to necessitate the conclusion which our opponents draw from them. As to the rendering suggested by the first class of opponents, it is opposed by the Hebrew manner of speech, by the text and the context of the passage itself. When in Hebrew after a verb

of "calling" several names are given, they apply not to the person naming, but to the person named (cf. Gen. ii. 20; iv. 25; xvi. 15; xxi. 3; Ruth iv. 17; I. Kings i. 20; Jer. xxiii. 6). Then, it appears from the text that all the names are construed in the same manner; hence they must either all apply to the person who gives the name (Abarbanel), or to the person named. But in the former supposition the child would remain without name, and in the latter supposition the position of our opponents becomes untenable. Finally, the context shows that if all the names were applied to the person naming, they would form a series of attributes for which there is no warrant in what precedes and follows; the context does not even so much as suggest *Jehovah*. But, on the other hand, applied to the prophetic child, all these attributes fit admirably into the passage.

As to the arguments of the second class of our opponents, it suffices to point out:  $\alpha$ . that in the prophetic language the perfect is often used instead of the future;  $\beta$ . that the divine attribute in Ps. ii. applies not to a mere man, but to the son of God, or the Messiah;  $\gamma$ . that the Oriental writers are by no means accustomed to call eminent men "gods," unless they are judges, and thus represent God's own power and wisdom;  $\delta$ . that even in this case they never call any one "God," as *Isaias* does in the present passage.  $\epsilon$ . As to what is said concerning the evolution of the Messianic idea, no one, not even our opponents, has the right or the power to assign limits to the power or the will of the Holy Ghost, who speaks through the mouth of the prophets; and moreover, Ps. lxxi. (lxxii.) 5, 17 and Is. vii. 14 express ideas concerning the Messiah that are in strict accord with Is. ix. 6.

**3. MESSIANIC CHARACTER OF THE PROPHECY.**—*a*. It appears from II. Kings vii. 11; Ps. lxxxviii. (lxxxix.); lxxi. (lxxii.); cxxxi. (cxxxii.); Prov. viii.; Is. vii. 14; Ps. xlv. (xlv.), that the Messiah is a mighty king, the liberator of his people, the son of David, the triumphant conqueror of his enemies, the bringer of peace and justice and goodness,

that he is God and the son of God and Emmanuel. Hence it follows that he is most wonderful, gifted with divine wisdom, and holding the divine counsels. Now, the child whom Isaias describes accurately agrees with all these details, and is therefore identical with the Messiah of the other prophets.

*b.* The New Testament confirms this conclusion. For in the New Testament Jesus Christ is so described as to fulfil all the particular details of Is. ix. 6; Luke ii. 10-14 exhibits Christ as a child recently born in the city of David, and, at the same time, as the source of great joy to all the people; Luke ii. 23 announces the Messianic light to have come with the child Christ; Jo. viii. 12 calls Jesus the light of the world; the same attribute is given to Jesus in Jo. xii. 46; i. 9. Again, according to Isaias the child is to be the author of peace for the tribes of Zabulon and Nephtali, and Matt. iv. 13-16 represents Jesus as being this Author of peace.

*c.* The patristic testimonies, or rather the proper references to them, explaining one and all the prophecy of the Messiah, may be seen in Kilber's *Analysis Biblica*, ed. II. vol. i. pp. 357 ff.

*d.* Finally, the unbiassed testimony of the Synagogue too has always regarded the prophecy of Isaias as referring to the Messiah. We read in Midrash on Dent. ii. 4, sect. 1: "Rabbi Samuel, the son of Nachman, said: When Esau met Jacob, he said to him: My brother Jacob, let us walk together in this world. Jacob replied: Let my lord, I pray thee, pass over before his servant (Gen. xxxiii. 14). What is the meaning of, I pray thee, pass over? Jacob said to him: I have yet to supply the king Messiah, of whom it is said: Unto us a child is born." The Midrash on Numbers vi. 22, sect. 11, has it: "Rabbi Nathan said, 'and give thee peace' (Num. vi. 26) means the peace of the government of the house of David, as it is said, There shall be no end of peace." The Talmudic treatise Sanhedrin (fol. 94, col. 1) has the following words on our prophetic passage: "Bar



Kappara expounded at Sepphoris: Why is the word 'lem-arbeh' ('the increase,' cf. ix. 7) written with a closed Mem (the final Mem, and not with the usual Mem)? The Holy One, blessed be he, wished to make Ezechias the Messias, and Sennacherib Gog and Magog. But the attribute of judgment pleaded against it, and said: David the king of Israel repeated so many songs and praises, and thou hast not made him the Messias; and yet thou art thinking of making Ezechias the Messias, for whose sake so many miracles have been performed, and who nevertheless has not repeated one song of praise! So that counsel was closed (and hence the closed Mem)."

IS. IX. 1-7.

At the first time the land of Zabulon and the land of Nephtali was lightly touched, and at the last the way of the sea beyond the Jordan of the Galilee of the Gentiles was heavily loaded. The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light; to them that dwelt in the region of the shadow of death light is risen. Thou hast multiplied the nation, and hast not increased the joy. They shall rejoice before thee, as they that rejoice in the harvest, as conquerors rejoice after taking a prey, when they divide the spoils. For the yoke of their burden and the rod of their shoulder, and the sceptre of their oppressor thou hast overcome as in the day of Madian. For every violent taking of spoils, with tumult, and garment mingled with blood, shall be burnt,

<sup>1</sup> **The way of the sea.** This expression is parallel to "the land of Zabulon and the land of Nephtali," along the seashore. Whether "beyond Jordan" signifies the Peraean district, or the country west of the sea of Galilee, is impossible to tell, since the Hebrew preposition in this place means either "across" or "on this side" of the Jordan. The words "was lightly touched" and "was heavily loaded" indicate "was rendered vile" and "was honored." Instead of the phrase "and hast not increased the joy," the Massorettes, the LXX., the Chaldee, and the Syriac versions, together with the Arabic translator Saadias, read: "and thou hast increased the joy unto it."

<sup>2</sup> **Every violent taking of spoils.** This sentence should be rendered: "For all the armor of the armed men in the tumult (or, every boot of the booted warrior), and the garments rolled in blood, shall be for burning, for fuel of fire." The meaning of the passage is that the peace shall be so great that no war implements will be further needed.

and be fuel for the fire. For a child is born to us, and a son is given to us, and the government is upon his shoulder; and his <sup>2</sup> name shall be called, Wonderful, Counsellor, God, the Mighty, the Father of the world to come, the Prince of peace. His empire shall be multiplied, and there shall be no end of peace; he shall sit upon the <sup>4</sup> throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to establish it, and strengthen it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth and for ever; the zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this.

#### COROLLARY.

The present prophecy is a most powerful proof, showing that even in the Old Testament the mystery of the Incarnation was revealed to the Jews precisely under the concept of one person, who is both God and man. For in other prophecies where the manhood of the Messiah is insisted on, we may doubt about his divinity; and, again, in those prophecies in which his divinity is foretold. Ps. xlv. (xlv.), e.g., the human predicates attributed to him may be understood as merely anthropomorphic expressions. But in the present prophecy both the Messiah's divinity is clearly indicated and his humanity is spoken of in such a manner that no figure of speech can explain the expressions: "Jesus Christ yesterday, and to-day, and the same for ever" (Heb. xiii. 8).

<sup>3</sup> **And his name shall be called.** The following names must be taken in pairs, so as to signify: wonderful counsellor, mighty God, father of the coming age, and prince of peace. The renderings of the Rabbinic writers and of the Rationalists, who do not agree with the foregoing, are hardly worth noticing. Abarbanel, e.g., renders "father of booty" instead of "father of the world to come." Ewald and a few others render "divine hero" instead of "mighty God;" but even the collocation of the Hebrew words contradicts this rendering, since we ought to read "gibbor el" instead of "el gibbor" in order to obtain the meaning "divine hero."

<sup>4</sup> **The throne of David** Nathan in II. Kings vii. 11 ff. explains what is meant by the throne of David. For the prophet promises to David a son who will build God a temple, and in whose posterity the royal power will be perpetuated for ever. This eternal kingdom to which the prophet refers in the present passage is the Church of Christ, as may be inferred from Luke i. 32.

## APPENDIX.

### RABBINIC LITERATURE.

THROUGHOUT the course of this work we have been frequently obliged to refer to Rabbinic authors and works not generally known to the public. In order to avoid disagreeable interruptions and untimely descriptions of such writers and books, we have deemed it advisable to add a brief outline of the more important ones by way of appendix. Since an exhaustive treatment of this subject would fill a number of goodly volumes, we must content ourselves with a mere sketch of names and dates, without entering into any disputed points of chronology or authorship. Those who wish to study these questions more thoroughly must seek for information in such works as Bartolucci's "*Bibliotheca magna Rabbinica*," Basnage's "*Histoire des Juifs depuis Jésus Christ jusqu' à présent*," *Biographie Universelle*, *British Encyclopædia*, Jost's "*Geschichte der Israeliten seit der Zeit der Maccabäer bis auf unsere Tage*," and Wolf's "*Bibliotheca Hebræa*." Since many of the Rabbinic works presuppose a knowledge of the existence and method of the Jewish traditional learning, we shall endeavor to describe also the latter in so far as the nature of the present work requires. Students who wish to give more attention to this matter will find references to books and writers on the subject in Myer's "*Qabbalah*" (Philadelphia, 1888) and Edersheim's "*The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*," vol. ii., pp. 683 ff.

Besides their written revelations, the Jews had a system of traditional doctrine, which is known in our days by the name *Qabbalah* (reception). But since the meaning of

the term has become very comprehensive, we may divide it for convenience' sake into an artificial and a doctrinal one. The artificial Qabbalah may be subdivided into the theoretic and the practical. The latter differs little from magic, and is said to have effected portentous miracles by its spells and charms (see Edzard's edit. of chapter 2 of tract Abodah Zarah, pp. 346 f.). The principal kinds of the former are three: Gematria, Notaricon, and Temurah.

1. Gematria considers the letters of a word according to their numerical value, and infers from the identity of the numerical value of two expressions the identity of their meaning. Thus, e.g., Yabo' Shiloh represents the value of  $10 + 2 + 1 + 300 + 10 + 30 + 5 = 358$ ; Mashiach too is equivalent to  $40 + 300 + 10 + 8 = 358$ . Consequently, the expression Yabo' Shiloh (Gen. xlix. 10) is identical in meaning with Mashiach.

2. Notaricon takes every letter of a phrase to be the initial letter or the abbreviation of a word, or it forms the initials and final letters of several expressions into separate words. Thus, e.g., 'Adam is explained by 'Aphar (dust), Dam (blood), and Marah (gall); similarly, by reversing the process, the three words 'Aphar, Dam, and Marah may be ranged under Notaricon by being explained as meaning 'Adam. Two other methods of interpretation belong to this second class of doctrinal Qabbalah. The words of several verses in the Hebrew text are written one under the other, and the letters are formed into words by reading them vertically, or the words are ranged in squares, and then read either vertically or boustrophedon.

3. Temurah (permutation) is a mode by which a word is transformed into a different one by a transposition or a systematic change of consonants. Thus letters of the same word may be transposed, or several words may be joined together and their letters redivided into new words. "Name," e.g., thus becomes "mane;" "Hebrew sport" may be read "he brews port." The principal systematic changes of letters are known by the names "Albam" and "Ath-

bash." In "Albam" the twenty-two letters of the Hebrew alphabet are divided into two halves; one half is placed above the other, and the two consonants which thus become associated are interchanged. In this manner Aleph becomes Lamed, Beth becomes Mem, etc. If the last letter of the alphabet is interchanged with the first, the last but one with the second, and so forth, Aleph becomes Tav, Beth becomes Shin, so that we obtain the cipher-alphabet known as Athbash. This is applied in Jer. xxvi. 26; li. 41, where "Sheshach" is written for Babel, and in Jer. li. 1 "Leb Qamay" stands for Kashdim.

But all this belongs to the artificial Qabbalah, and has been mentioned here only for the sake of completeness. It is the doctrinal Qabbalah that concerns our question directly. Its principal divisions are: *a.* the exegetical and *b.* the systematic Qabbalah.

*A.* The former dwells: 1. on letters (e.g., Is. ix. 7, where Talmud Sanhedrin, fol. 94, col. 1, lengthily explains the closed Mem); 2. on words (e.g., zoth of Ps. cxviii. 22; xxvii. 3; Gen. ix. 12, 17; Jer. ix. 23; Gen. xxix. 27; iii. 13; Lev. xvi. 3, etc., is explained in Tikkune Zohar c. xix. fol. 39, 1; c. xx. fol. 48, 2; c. xeviii. princ., etc., as meaning the Messias); 3. on whole verses and sections.

To understand the character of this exegesis better, it must be observed that the principal code of the Qabbalists is the Zohar, i.e., Light, so called from the words "Let there be light" (Gen. i. 4) with the explanation of which the book opens. The work is a commentary on the Pentateuch, according to its division into fifty-two hebdomadal lessons, and is written in Aramaic. Interspersed throughout the Zohar and bound together with it are the following dissertations: 1. Siphra d'Tzinuthah, or the Book of Secrets, containing discourses on cosmogony and demonology; 2. Idrah Rabbah, "the Great Assembly," or discourses of Rabbi Simon to his numerous assembly of disciples on the form of the Deity and on Pneumatology; 3. Idrah Zutah, "the Small Assembly," or discourses on the

Sephiroth delivered by R. Simon to the small congregation of his six surviving disciples; 4. *Saba d' Mispatim*, "the Aged One in Mispatim" (Ex. xxi.-xxiv., incl.), a work in which the prophet Elias discourses with R. Sinron on the doctrine of transmigration; 5. *Midrash Ruth*, a fragmentary commentary on the book of Ruth; 6. *Sepher Habbahir*, "Book of Brightness;" 7. *Tosephthah*, "Additions and Supplements;" 8. *Rayah Mechemnah*, "the Faithful Shepherd," recording discussions between Moses the faithful shepherd, Elias, and R. Simon ben Yochai; 9. *Haikhaloth*, "the Mansions and Abodes," describes the structure of paradise and hell; 10. *Sithrai Torah*, "the Mysteries of the Pentateuch," describing the evolution of the Sephiroth; 11. *Midrash Hannee'lam*, "the Hidden Interpretation," deducing esoteric doctrines from the narratives of the Pentateuch; 12. *Raze d'Razin*, "the Secret of Secrets," treating of physiognomy and psychology; 13. *Midrash 'Hazeeth*, "Interpretation of the Song of Solomon;" 14. *Maa'mar Tochazi*, "Discourse (beginning with) Come and See;" 15. *Yenukah*, "the Discourse of the Youth," gives discourses by young men of superhuman origin on the mysteries of ablutions; 16. *Pekudah*, "Explanation of the Pentateuch;" 17. *Hibburah Kadma'a*, "the Primary Assembly;" 18. *Mathanithan*, "We have learned," or we have traditionally received the doctrines. All of these are found in the Sulzbach and Cremona editions of the *Zohar*; the Mantua edition wants nn. 3, 5, 6, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17. The Cremona edition, published 1558-1560, is in folio and is called the *Great Zohar*. Most western Jews use it. The Mantua edition, published by R. Meir ben Ephraim da Padova (1558), is in quarto, in three volumes, and is called the *Little Zohar*. Italian and Oriental Jews use it.

*B.* The systematic Qabalah contains under certain symbols a system of doctrine embracing the nature and the attributes of God, the cosmogony, the creation of angels and of man, the destiny, the atonement, the import of the law. The principal symbols are, according to Schöttgen,



four: 1. the Qabbalistic Tree; 2. the Chariot-throne of Ezechiel; 3. the Work of Creation; 4. the Ancient of days.

A short notice on the manner in which the revealed truth has been preserved in the Synagogue will throw more light on this subject, and facilitate future reference. We shall name both the agents that have taken part in preserving the revealed truth, and also the principal books written for the same purpose:

1. *a.* The first series of Jewish receivers and transmitters of revelation may be called the prophetic school. All the prophets wrote their works under divine inspiration, and, besides, the later prophets collected those inspired books that had been written before their time. The Introduction to the *Yad-Chazaka* (a commentary on the Talmud) of Maimonides gives the following series of twenty-two prophets as the principal bearers of tradition:

1. Moses (about 1537–1457 B.C.); concerning the manner in which he taught Aaron, Eleazar, Itamar, the Ancients, and especially Josue, see Talmud, *Erubin*, fol. 54 verso.

2. Josue (about 1457–1400 B.C.; *Jos.* xxiv. 29).

3. Phinees, the son of Eleazar and the grandson of Aaron, together with the then existing Ancients (about 1400–1210 B.C.; *Jos.* xxiv. 33).

4. Heli the high-priest (about 1210–1170 B.C.; *I. Kings* iv. 18).

5. Samuel the prophet (about 1170–1080 B.C.; *I. Kings* iii. 20 f.; xxv. 1).

6. David the king (about 1080–1021 B.C.; *I. Kings* xvi. 13; *II. Kings* xxiii. 1 ff.; *III. Kings* ii. 10 f.).

7. Ahias of Silo, the Levite, who had according to tradition been born in Egypt and instructed by Moses, so that at this period he was more than 500 years old (about 1021–970 B.C.; *III. Kings* xi. 29; xiv. 2 ff.).

8. Elias the prophet (about 970–902 B.C.; *III. Kings* xvii. ff.).

9. Eliseus the prophet (about 902–840 B.C.; *IV. Kings* ii. 9 ff.).

10. Yoyada the highpriest (about 878-830 B.C.; IV. Kings xi. 4 ff.; II. Par. xxiii. 1 ff.).

11. Zacharias the prophet, a son of Yoyada, probably slain between the temple and the altar (Matt. xxiii. 35). This is not the prophet Zacharias whose prophecies are embodied in the Old Testament canon (about 830-800 B.C.; II. Par. xxiv. 20 f.).

12. Osee the prophet (about 800-770 B.C.; Os.).

13. Amos the prophet (about 770-730 B.C.; Amos).

14. Isaias the prophet (about 759-696 B.C.; Is.).

15. Micheas the prophet (about 759-700 B.C.; Mich.).

16. Joel the prophet (about 786-720 B.C.; Joel).

17. Nahum the prophet (about 759-700 B.C.; Nah.).

18. Habacuc the prophet (about 660-610 B.C.; Hab.).

19. Sophonias the prophet (about 641-610 B.C.; Soph.).

20. Jeremias the prophet (about 628-583 B.C.; Jer.).

21. Baruch (about 600-583 B.C.; Bar.).

22. Esdras (about 530-460 B.C.; Esdr.).

It must be remembered that each of these bearers of tradition was assisted by a "beth din," a house of justice. The last named was president of the so-called "Great Synagogue," composed of 120 members. The prophets Aggeus, Zacharias, Malachias, and probably also Daniel, Ananias, Misael, Azarias, Nehemias, Mardocheus, Belsan, and Zorobabel were of the number. The last surviving member was Simeon the Just; but Esdras having collected the inspired writings of the Old Testament, Simeon must be numbered among the Tannaim rather than among the prophets.

*b.* "Tannaim" is the plural of Tanna, Doctor. As the prophets are either the authors or the collectors of the Old Testament, so are the Tannaim either the authors or the collectors of the Mishna, i.e., of a series of commentaries on the inspired books and of those truths that were believed to have been revealed to Moses on Mount Sinai, and to the other patriarchs and prophets, without having ever been committed to writing. In enumerating the successive

links of the bearers of tradition we shall again follow Maimonides.

23. Simeon the Just has already been mentioned as the last member of the Great Synagogue. He must have lived till about 400 B.C. It was he that originated the great Jewish council of the Sanhedrin.

24. Antigonus of Socho was Simeon's successor. Drach (*l'Église et la Synagogue*, i. p. 143) is of opinion that Antigonus flourished about 300 B.C., but Buxtorf (*Lexic. Chald.*, under the word "'Amora") maintains that the period of the great Synagogue and of Simeon the Just is placed by some between 400 and 300 B.C., by others between 400 and 200 B.C.

25. After Antigonus begins a double series of Tannaim, each link of which is composed of the president and the vice-president of the Sanhedrin; the couples are called "Zogoth." Joseph ben Joezer and Joseph ben Jochanan were the first couple. The former was Nasi, or president; the latter, "Ab-beth-din," or vice-president.

26. Joshua ben Perachiah and Nitai of Arbela were the next Zoga. Joseph was persecuted by Alexander Jannæus and fled to Alexandria.

27. Judah ben Tabbai succeeded as president, and Simon ben Shetach as vice-president. According to Lightfoot, one of their many eminent actions consisted in burning eighty witches in one day.

28. These were followed by Shemaiah and Abtalion, both proselytes of justice and descendants of Sennacherib (*IV. Kings* xix. 22). They are probably identical with the Sameas and Pollio of Josephus.

29. The succeeding president was Hillel, the vice-president Shammai. Hillel is sometimes called the Babylonian, because he had been born in that city, though he belonged on his mother's side to the family of David. When forty years old, he came to Jerusalem; forty years he studied the law, and forty years he was president of the Sanhedrin. Shammai and Hillel were theological antagonists, and their

pupils adhered so zealously to their masters' tenets that their wrangles sometimes ended in bloodshed and murder. Hillel always gave a mild interpretation of the Law, while Shammai was a legal rigorist. The influence of these two doctors on the Jewish mind was permanent.

30. The next couple of tradition-bearers consisted of Rabban Jochanan ben Zaccai and Rabban Simeon ben Hillel. Some writers have endeavored to identify this Simeon with the Simeon of St. Luke's gospel, who took Jesus in his arms (Luke ii. 25 f.). To this circumstance they attribute the ill-will against Simeon shown in the Talmud. For both the treatises *Aboth* and *Halikhuth-Olam*, though professedly discussing the Fathers of Tradition, omit the name of Simeon. Other Rabbinic writers enumerate Rabban Simeon among the descendants of Hillel, but give no further particulars of his person or his teaching. Still there are serious difficulties against the view that Rabban Simeon is identical with the old man Simeon; the chronology of the gospel and the exalted position of the Rabban furnish probably the most striking ones. It must here also be observed that the title Rabban was above that of Nasi, or president of the Sanhedrin. Simeon was therefore not a mere vice-president, but he had the same authority as Rabban Jochanan. A number of scholars omit the name of Jochanan ben Zaccai in connection with Rabban Simeon, and make him temporary president after Simeon ben Gamaliel. Thus Buxtorf (l.c.) and Milman (*History of the Jews*, ii. p. 411).

31. Gamaliel (ben Simeon) is the next link of tradition. He is well known as the teacher of St. Paul; St. Barnabas and the proto-martyr St. Stephen also were his pupils. Later he himself became a Christian; the martyrology for August 3 mentions his name together with that of his son Abibon. Clement of Alexandria, Bede, and other writers are of opinion that Gamaliel was a secret adherent of Christ even when he defended the apostles before the Sanhedrin (Acts v. 34 f.). At his own desire he was

buried in the sepulchre of St. Stephen, whose remains he had entombed in his own house; the relics of both were discovered in 415 A.D., a special revelation having directed the priest Lucian to the spot. See Martyrol. and Bollandists.

32. Rabban Simeon II. (ben Gamaliel) was the successor of his father.

According to Buxtorf, Rabban Jochanan ben Zaccai held Simeon's place for a time. The purity and honor of the Law had failed, and Pharisaism had died with Gamaliel. Simeon II. is said to have flourished between the destruction of the temple and 80 A.D. Drach (l. c.) gives Rabbi Judah hakkadosh as the successor of Simeon II. But Maimonides, whom Drach follows, has evidently omitted several links, which we supply from Buxtorf and Milman without adding any number, so as to indicate by the numbered series that of Maimonides. Simeon's successor was Gamaliel II. of Jabneh (ben Simeon II.); he was followed by Simeon III. (ben Gamaliel II.), who was the first patriarch of Tiberias.

Buxtorf maintains that the school of Jabneh had been founded by Rabban Jochanan ben Zaccai when Jerusalem and the temple were besieged. Jost (*Judenthum*, ii. 16 f.) gives the Rabbinic belief concerning the various transfers of the Sanhedrin: from Gazith (the temple chamber) to Khanoth (the shops in the outer court); from Khanoth to Jerusalem, from Jerusalem to Jabneh, from Jabneh to Osha, from Osha to Shepharaam, from Shepharaam to Bethshaaraim, from Bethshaaraim to Sepphoris, from Sepphoris to Tiberias. At Osha, Shepharaam, Bethshaaraim, and Sepphoris the council cannot have stayed long, since Gamaliel II. was its president at Jabneh, and his successor, Simeon III., was president at Tiberias.

33. Simeon III. was followed by Judah (ben Simeon III.). Judah was born about 120 years after the destruction of Jerusalem at Zipporis or Sepphoris, an important and strongly fortified city of Galilee, contiguous to Mount

Carmel and Cana, and six miles west of Nazareth. At a later period the town was called Diocæsarea. It is also reported to be the birth-place of St. Ann, the mother of the Blessed Virgin. Judah, called "hakkadosh" (the holy) or "hannasi" (the Nasi, or president by eminence), was by far the most renowned of all the later Tannaim. His adviser was Rabbi Pinchas ben Yair. Not to mention many other things he did or decided, we proceed at once to his principal work, the Mishna, which he collected and finished. The beginning of such a collection had been made by the preceding Rabbis, such as R. Akiba and R. Meir; but only single halachoth (laws of custom) had been committed to writing without system and order. R. Judah examined what had been written, completed the writing of the halachoth, and arranged all systematically. The language used is that found in the later Old Testament books, enriched by many Aramaic, Latin, and Greek words. Among the Jews of Babylon only the work of Judah was received as having authority, while in Palestine certain later additions enjoyed the authority of the Mishna.

The elements of which the Misha is composed have been stated above in general terms. Both Drach (*op. cit.* v. 1, pp. 151 f.) and Maimonides (General Preface to Comm. on the Mishna) reduce them to five: 1. Explanations and developments of the written law attributed to Moses; 2. unwritten ordinances which God gave to Moses on Sinai; 3. the precepts found by the conjectures and investigations of the doctors; 4. decrees issued by the prophets and the later doctors, in order to insure a more exact observance of the Law; 5. rules of conduct, which often refer to circumstances of the civil and social life, without adding to or detracting from the written Law. St. Epiphanius most probably understood the first four elements by his four "deuteroses" (*Hær.* 23, p. 224). For "deuterosis" is the Greek word for Mishna, both words meaning "repetition;" the Mishna is thus viewed as a repetition of the written Law. By this explanation one of Morin's arguments for



the late origin of the Mishna is answered; for Epiphanius expressly refers to it in the above passage.

A general outline of the plan of the Mishna is not out of place here. The book is divided into six "Sedarim" (orders, dispositions, divisions); each "Seder" is subdivided into "massikhtoth" (treatises), each "massekheth" into "perakim" (chapters), each "perek" into paragraphs, called Mishnas. The division into "sedarim" (orders) must have preceded the time of R. Judah, since the Targum of Jonathan ben Uziel (Ex. xxvi. 9), and the Chaldee paraphrases (Cant. i. 2; v. 10) refer to it.

The following list gives the various divisions and subdivisions of the Mishna:

1. Seder zeraim (order of seeds) contains eleven massikhtoth:

1. Massekheth perakhoth (treatise of blessings) gives in nine chapters precepts concerning prayer and thanksgiving for the fruits of the earth and other blessings of God.

2. Massekheth pe'ah (treatise of the corner) contains eight chapters on harvesting and leaving corners of the harvest-field for the poor.

3. Massekheth demai (treatise of the doubtful) settles in seven chapters doubts regarding the obligation of tithes for certain fruits.

4. Massekheth kilaim (treatise of the heterogeneous) regulates in nine chapters the mixing of certain kinds of seed.

5. Massekheth shebiith (treatise of the seventh) has ten chapters on the sabbath year.

6. Massekheth terumah (treatise on oblation) prescribes in eleven chapters various kinds of free-will gifts.

7. Massekheth ma'asher rishon (treatise on the first tithe) regulates in five chapters the tithes belonging to the Levites.

8. Massekheth ma'asher sheni (treatise on the second tithe) has five chapters on the tithes which the Levites had to pay to the priests.

9. Massekheth challah (treatise of the cake) describes in

four chapters the cake which the women had to offer to the priests.

10. Massekheth 'orlah (treatise on the prepuce) has three chapters on the fruits of young trees, called prepuce.

11. Massekheth bikkurim (treatise on the first-fruits) examines in four chapters what first-fruits should be brought into the temple. At the end of this seder is added a chapter entitled "Androgynos" (hermaphrodite), which constitutes one of the Beraitoth.

*B.* Seder Mo'ed (order of festivals) contains twelve masikhtoth:

1. Massekheth shabbath (treatise on the Sabbath) has twenty-four chapters on the keeping of the Sabbath.

2. 'Erubin (treatise on mixings) shows in ten chapters how many neighbors might be united into one legal household by placing, on the evening of the Sabbath, the food in certain positions.

3. Pesach (treatise on the Passover) gives ten chapters on the celebration of the feast of Passover.

4. Shekalim (treatise on shekels) regulates in eight chapters the individual contributions towards the sacrificial expenses.

5. Yoma (treatise on the day) contains eight chapters on the keeping of the day of Atonement.

6. Sukkah (treatise on the tent) gives in five chapters the ritual for the Feast of Tabernacles.

7. Betzah (treatise on the egg), so called because it begins with an investigation whether one may eat on a feast-day the egg which a hen has laid on the same day; then it gives in five chapters other works lawful or unlawful on feast-days, excepting the Sabbath.

8. Rosh hasshanah (treatise on the new year) contains four chapters on the regulations concerning the Feast of New Year, which falls on the new moon of the month of Tisri.

9. Ta'anith (treatise on fasting) has four chapters on fasting.

10. Meghillah (treatise on the roll) gives four chapters on the feast of Purim, at which the roll-book of Esther had to be read.

11. Mo'ed katon (treatise on the small feasts) regulates in three chapters the minor festivals.

12. Chaghigha treats in three chapters of the triple annual journey to Jerusalem prescribed by Ex. xxiii. 17.

*C.* Seder nashim (order of women) has seven Massikhtoth:

1. Massekhet yebamoth (treatise on levirate affinities) has sixteen chapters on marrying a deceased brother's wife, who has had no children by her husband.

2. Kethuboth (treatise on contracts) has thirteen chapters on matrimonial contracts, etc.

3. Nedarim (treatise on vows) contains eleven chapters on vows.

4. Neziroth (treatise on the Nazarites) gives nine chapters on the special vows, the life, etc., of the Nazarites.

5. Gittin (treatise on the bills of divorce) explains in nine chapters the laws concerning divorce.

6. Sotah (treatise on the declining one) has nine chapters on women convicted or suspected of adultery.

7. Kiddushim (treatise on betrothal) has four chapters on betrothment.

*D.* Seder Nezikim (order of damages) has ten Massikhtoth:

1. Massekhet baba kama (treatise on the first gate) considers in ten chapters the damages sustained by men and beasts from one another.

2. Baba metzi'a (treatise on the middle gate) has ten chapters on things found and deposited, etc.

3. Baba bathra (treatise on the last gate) contains ten chapters on buying, selling, inheritances, etc.

4. Sanhedrin consists of eleven chapters on the Great Council, punishments, witnesses, judges, and the reward in the other life.

5. *Makkoth* (treatise on stripes) contains three chapters on the 40 stripes spoken of in Deut. xxv. 3.

6. *Shebu'oth* (treatise on oaths) states in eight chapters the regulations concerning oaths.

7. *'Edaioth* (treatise on testimony) has eight chapters respecting witnesses.

8. *'Aboth* (treatise on the Fathers) contains six chapters about the Jewish fathers.

9. *Horaioth* (treatise on statutes) contains three chapters on the laws according to which every one must judge in cases of trial.

10. *'Abodah zarah* (treatise on foreign service), also called *'abodah elilim* (service of idols) or *'abodah kokhabim* (service of the stars), consists of five chapters concerning idolatry and communion with the idolatrous Christians. This *massekhet* is omitted in the Basel edition of the *Mishna*.

*E. Seder kodashim* (order of holy things) contains eleven *massikhtoth*:

1. *Massekhet zebachim* (treatise on sacrifices) contains fourteen chapters regarding sacrifices.

2. *Menachoth* (treatise on oblations) gives thirteen chapters regarding the evening offerings.

3. *Chollin* (treatise on the unclean) distinguishes in twelve chapters clean and unclean animals.

4. *Bekhoroth* (treatise on the first-born) contains nine chapters regarding the first-born of animals.

5. *Arakhin* (treatise on valuation) values in nine chapters the things dedicated to God.

6. *Temurah* (treatise on permutation) has seven chapters on the substitution of one sacrifice for another.

7. *Kerithuth* (treatise on cutting off) contains six chapters on the exclusion of a soul from the future life.

8. *Me'ilah* (treatise on prevarication) considers in six chapters the sins committed in sacrificing animals.

9. *'Tamid* (treatise on the perpetual) has six chapters concerning the daily sacrifices.

10. Middoth (treatise on measures) relates in five chapters the measurements of the temple.

11. Kinnim (treatise on the nests) contains in three chapters a treatise on bird's nests.

*F.* Seder taharoth (order of purifications) contains twelve massikhtoht:

1. Kelim (treatise on vessels) contains thirty chapters on the purification of furniture, clothes, etc.

2. Oholoth (treatise on tents) considers in eighteen chapters the uncleanness of houses, etc.

3. Nega'im (treatise on leprosy) has fourteen chapters on lepers.

4. Parah (treatise on the heifer) contains twelve chapters respecting the red heifer. Num. xix.

5. Taharoth (treatise on purifications) describes in ten chapters the purification of a person made unclean by touching anything unclean.

6. Mikva'oth (treatise on baths) considers in ten chapters the basins of water in which the Jews washed in case of uncleanness.

7. Niddah (treatise on impurity) contains ten chapters on the uncleanness of women.

8. Makhshirin (treatise on purifiers) describes in six chapters the purifying fluids.

9. Zabim (treatise on the flow) speaks in five sections of nocturnal pollution.

10. Tebul Jom (treatise on the washing on the same day) has four chapters respecting purification on the same day.

11. Jadaim (treatise on hands) regulates in four chapters the washing of hands.

12. Uqtsin (treatise on stalks) has three chapters on the manner in which the stalks of fruit become unclean by touching other fruit.

In the later editions of the Talmud the Massekheh Makkoth in the fourth order is followed by six little

massikhtoth of more recent origin. They are the following:

1. Aboth of Rabbi Nathan, containing forty-one chapters of moral sentences of the Jewish Fathers, collected by Rabbi Nathan.

2. Sopherim contains twenty-one chapters of instructions for the writers of the Synagogue-rolls.

3. 'Ebel Rabbathi has fourteen chapters on the mourning for the dead.

4. Kallah is a chapter on the way of marrying.

5. Derekh 'eretz rabbah contains ten chapters on politeness.

6. Derekh 'eretz suttah has six chapters on the same subject.

This whole additional part is closed by the Perek Shalom, or the chapter on peace.

After completing the Mishna R. Judah continued to explain the doctrine it contained, and a number of his disciples wrote the explanations in order to fill the gaps still left in the records of tradition. Among the Babylonian Jews these writings do not seem to have enjoyed great authority; in Palestine they were received with a reverence equal to that for the Mishna. The following list gives the principal additional works:

1. Tosephta (Supplement) written by R. Chiya with the assistance of Hoshaiya (Ushaya), Nechemia, Bar Kappara, Yanai, and Levi ben Sissi. Tosephta and its plural Tosephtoth must be well distinguished from the Tosephtoth or marginal notes of the Talmud, the authors of which are the Ba'ale Tosephtoth, most of whom lived about the thirteenth century in the south of France.

2. Bereshith-Rabba, written by Rabbi Hoshaiya (Ushaya) and distinct from the Bereshith-Rabba, or Midrash-Rabba, by Rabba bar Nachmeni (see below, n. 8).

3. Beraitoth, plural of Beraita (Borayitoh, Boraytah), means "extraneous." According to Buxtorf this name comprises the traditions of the Tannaim written outside



of Jerusalem; Drach explains the name as indicating that these writings are outside of the Mishna proper. Some of these were composed by Hoshaiya and Bar Kappara; others by Chiya and Hoshaiya; others, again, by Simeon.

4. Mechiltoth, plural of Mechilta; one Meehilta, an explanation of Ex. xii. 2-xxxv. 3, was written by Rabbi Ismael, and is preceded by the thirteen ways of Rabbinic reasoning. Another Meehilta, an explanation of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, was written by ben Azai, but is now lost.

5. Siphra, or Torath Cohanim (the book or law of priests), was written by Rabbi Judah, probably the second of that name. It is an explanation of Leviticus.

6. Siphre is a dogmatic exposition of the books of Numbers and Deuteronomy, by Rabbi Nehemias.

7. Zohar (Light) was composed, or at least begun, by Rabbi Simeon ben Yochai and R. Abba, the Babylonian. It is a commentary on the Pentateuch, and has been noticed above as the principal book of the systematic Kabbalah.

8. Midrash-Rabba is a commentary on the Pentateuch and the five Meghilloth (Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Eccles., Esther). Rabba bar Nachmeni is assigned as its author. The commentaries on the single books are often indicated by the first word of the respective book followed by Rabba; e.g., the commentary on Genesis by Bereshith-Rabba (cf. n. 2).

9. A number of Midrashim on separate books of the Old Testament, e.g., the Psalms, Samuel, etc.; also the Mishle on Samuel, Psalms, and Proverbs.

10. Midrash Yalkut, called also the Midrash Simeoni, is a modern compilation by a Jewish preacher for the use of his colleagues (cf. Drach, *l'Église et la Synagogue*, vol. i. pp. 152 ff.).

11. Schöttgen (*Jesus der Messias*, p. 58) adds Pirqué Rabbi Eliezer on Genesis and a part of Exodus, Pesikta Rabbetha on various texts, and Pesikta Sotarta, compiled,

or "zusammengetragen," as Schöttgen says, out of the lost *Mechilta* (n. 4), *Siphra* (n. 5), and *Siphre* (n. 6).

After the diverse elements of oral traditions had been committed to writing by the Tannaim, the succeeding Jewish Rabbis exerted themselves to explain these writings, especially the principal one of them, the *Mishna*. The doctors who first gave these explanations and collected them in writings are called 'Amoraim (speakers, commentators). There is a twofold collection of such explanations, the one made by the Palestinian 'Amoraim, the other by the Babylonian; the former is called the *Gemara* (Supplement) of Jerusalem, the latter the *Gemara* of Babylon. We have seen that Rabbi Judah hakkadosh, or hannasi, finished the *Mishna* between 190 and 220 A.D. He was followed by Gamaliel III. (ben Judah) as president of the school in Yamma and, according to the Jews, as patriarch of Sepphoris. Gamaliel was as proud and overbearing as he was learned, and on that account was formally deposed, R. Eliezer being elected in his place. But by the influence of R. Joshua, R. Akiba, and R. Eliezer himself, Gamaliel was reinstated with the agreement that R. Eliezer should every third week preside over and moderate the scholastic discussions. Buxtorf and other scholars maintain that it was Gamaliel II. who was deposed, and who held after his reinstatement joint authority with R. Eliezer. This view avoids a number of serious chronological difficulties. Gamaliel III. was succeeded by R. Judah II., who transferred the patriarchal seat from Sepphoris to Tiberias. His authority was so great that he obtained the title of Rabbi by excellence, and of Rabbann. Still Rabbi Yochanan ben Eliezer enjoyed an even greater authority, and is by Maimonides given among the three who had received the esoteric traditions from R. Judah hakkadosh. Yochanan is said to have finished the Jerusalem *Gemara* about 279 A.D. (cf. Drach, l. c., vol. 1, p. 161) after having been 24 years Rector of the Palestinian Academy. Hillel, the brother of Judah II., excelled in the *Haggada*, or the his-

torical part of the Old Testament; Origen used his interpretations of difficult passages and highly lauded his learning. After the time of Judah II. the Palestinian schools became inferior to the Babylonian. The most renowned Palestinian Rabbi after this period is Rabbi Abbahu; R. Ami, R. Assi, R. Chiya ben Abba, and R. Seira hardly deserve mention. The succeeding western or Palestinian patriarchs are Rabbi Gamaliel IV., Rabbi Judah III., R. Hillel II.; during the latter's time the patriarchal authority almost wholly perished, since he ceased to indicate even the feast-days and published the general rule of computing feasts. Hillel II. was followed by Gamaliel V., R. Judah IV., and R. Gamaliel VI. No president is known to have succeeded Gamaliel VI.

Ever since the Babylonian captivity, the Jewish schools had flourished in the provinces of Babylon. The foremost seats of learning were Nahardea, Firuz-Shabur, Pumbeditha, Sura, and Machuza. Here the exiled Jews held, up to the eleventh century B.C., their own civil authority. A line of reputed descendants of David wielded supreme civil power, and enjoyed externally much of the pomp of ancient royalty. This high official was called Resh-Glutha, prince of the captivity, and he enjoyed the honor of being the fourth highest dignitary in the realm. Still, in theological lore the Babylonian Jews confessed themselves inferior to their Palestinian brethren, and many a youth left the shores of the Euphrates in order to learn wisdom in the schools of Sepphoris, Jamnia, or Tiberias. At the time when Judah, the author of the Mishna, was president, his Babylonian pupils excelled so much that according to tradition the master communicated the esoteric traditions to two Babylonians, Abba Areka, commonly called Rab, and Samuel, while only one Palestinian pupil, the above-named Jochanan, shared this privilege. Here then we may resume the chain of the bearers of tradition, the 33d link of which was R. Judah, the author of the Mishna.

34. Rab, or Abba Areka, and Samuel; Abba Areka was

immediately after his return from Palestine president of the school of Nahardea, the birth-place of Samuel, to whom he yielded this office. Rab founded the school of Sura, and was its first president from 219–247 A.D. (cf. Buxtorf under “’Amoraim”). Mar Samuel succeeded as president, who was not only well versed in the Law, but also skilled in medicine and astronomy.

35. R. Hunna (Rab Hanna) must have been one of the next presidents of Sura; he is named among the most renowned ’Amoraim. Soon after his accession there came troublous times for Babylon, which was then devastated by the troops of Odenath, husband of Queen Zenobia. Rabbi Nachman ben Jacob (and R. Chasda) fled to Pumbeditha, where now arose a new school of learning under Nachman as president. R. Judah ben Jechešel gave this school great lustre by accepting its presidency after Nachman. Rabba ben Nachman succeeded (309 A.D.), and he was followed by Abayi.

36. Raba, the next president of Pumbeditha, must probably be identified with Rabba bar Chana, the 36th link of the tradition-bearers. He was followed by the presidents R. Nachman ben Isaac, R. Papa, and R. Chama, whose office-time falls within 356–377 A.D. There is a veil of obscurity thrown over the following presidents: we know, however, that R. Zebid, R. Dimi, Rafrem ben Papa, R. Kahana, Mar Sutra, R. Acha ben Rabba, and R. Gebiha were inferior to the above-named rectors. R. José became president of Pumbeditha about 485 A.D.

About the same time that the school of Pumbeditha was founded by R. Nachman ben Jacob, the school of Machuza was established by Rabba ben Abahu (and R. Sheshet), who had fled from Sura on account of the same inroad of Odenath into Babylon which had occasioned the flight of Nachman and R. Chasda. Rabba was succeeded by R. Joseph ben Chiya, and he by R. Abaya.

37. Rabba ben Joseph ben Chama succeeded Abaya, and is given by Maimonides as the 37th link in the chain of

tradition. After Rabba's death the school of Machuza sank below its former level; and the school of Sura, from which both the schools of Pumbeditha and of Machuza had sprung forth, resumed its former leadership.

38. This was especially the case under the presidency of R. Ashi ben R. Semai; he rebuilt the old Rabbinic edifices at Sura, and spent over fifty years in explaining the Mishna and collecting material referring to the same, so that he did for the Babylonian Gemara what Rabbi Judah hamasi had done for the Mishna. After Ashi's death (427 A.D.), Mar Yemar (Maremar) became president, and after him Idi ben Abin (432 A.D.), Nachman ben Hunna (452 A.D.), and Acha (455).

39. R. Acha yielded his place to Mar, the returning son of the above-named R. Ashi, to whom and Mar Yemar the esoteric traditions had been confided. Mar ben Ashi faithfully continued the work of his father, but the troublous times which the Persian Jews had to endure in the reign of Firuz (458-485 A.D.) prevented the schools from exerting their full activity. Mar was succeeded by Rabba Tafsah, who became president of the Academy of Sura. He is the last member of the 'Amoraim, and to him belongs the lasting glory of having completed the Babylonian Gemara. Buxtorf places its official sanction in A.D. 499, the year of Rabina's death.

According to Buxtorf, Gemara means completion or supplement, since it completes the Mishna; other writers derive the word from the Aramaean "to learn," so that it is equivalent to Talmud (doctrine), from the Hebrew "lamad" (to learn). Both the Jerusalem and the Babylonian Gemara are written in Aramaic, with many Persian, Greek, and Latin words intermixed. Moreover, the Jerusalem Gemara approaches the Syriac in its style. But both are equally obscure and unpolished, though the Babylonian Gemara is more copious in its explanations than that of Jerusalem. The latter is preferred by Christians by reason of its brevity and freedom from absurdities and fables; the former is

always used by the Jews, and is simply called the Talmud; in both Talmuds the Mishna and its respective Gemara are included.

The Jerusalem Gemara explains all the treatises of the first and third orders, none of the fifth, and only Niddah of the sixth; in the second order the last four chapters of Shabbath are not explained; in the fourth the treatises Eduyoth, Aboth, and the last three chapters of Makkoth are wanting. The Babylonian Gemara explains only Berakhoth of the first order; in the explanation of the second order it omits Shekalim; in that of the fourth the treatises Aboth and Eduyoth are lacking; in the fifth Middoth, Kinnim, and one half of Tamid are not explained; Niddah is the only treatise of the sixth order that has been considered in the Babylonian Gemara, while the whole of the third order has been explained.

It was probably owing to the obscurity and brevity of the Jerusalem Gemara that the eastern Jewish doctors composed the Babylonian. It is said that R. Ashi had four ends in view when he began his great work: 1. He intended to investigate the grounds of the contradictory opinions contained in the Mishna, in order to arrive by this process at the true or, at least, at the more probable one. 2. Cases of doubt were to be settled in conformity with the doctrine of the Tannaim and the Amoraim. 3. The decisions, the enactments, and the regulations that had been passed by the Rabbis after the termination of the Mishna were to be recorded. 4. A number of current allegorical commentaries, of parables, legends, and mystic instructions were to be committed to writing. It is especially this fourth element that has caused the insertion into the Gemara of many absurd and ludicrous stories and revolting blasphemies (cf. Drach, *l'Église et la Synagogue*, vol. i. pp. 163 f.).

After the Amoraim a series of Rabbis followed, called Seburaim, or "opinionists," who discussed the Mishnayoth (paragraphs of the Mishna) by means of probable and disputable opinions, several of which have later been copied



into the text of the Talmud. It seems to be commonly agreed that the Seburaim did not last longer than about sixty years. Hence, according to the chronology that we have followed in the preceding paragraphs, they cover the period from about 510 to 560 A.D. But Myer and others believe that the "opinionists" reached to about 650 A.D. The Talmud may be said to have been terminated for the second and last time with the Seburaim, and after this period Jewish lore necessarily differed from what it had been until then.

The Rabbis who followed the Seburaim are called Ge'onim (plural of Ga'on), i.e., illustrious ones. Some scholars are of opinion that the name Ga'on was a mere symbol, its numerical value being sixty, by which number the Talmud was often indicated, since the treatises of the Mishna might be counted in such a manner as to amount to that number. Even if this conjecture is historically false, it indicates, at least, the real meaning of the title "Ga'on." He alone could claim this distinction who excelled in the knowledge of the Talmud. Formerly the knowledge of tradition (of both tenets and commentary) had been the requisite for an academic title; now the Talmud had supplanted tradition. The last Ga'on seems to have been the renowned Rabbi Hai, who died about 1038 A.D. A little before this period (1036 A.D.) the Persian king had put to death the last Resh-Glutha, or prince of the captivity, who was Hezekiah, grandson of David-ben-Zaccai, of David's royal blood. The Babylonian schools of Jewish learning were now closed forever, most of its Rabbis emigrating to the adjacent countries, and especially to Spain. The Jewish schools of Spain had even before this time enjoyed the privilege of having a Babylonian president. I. Myer, following the authority of Rabbi Abraham ben David Ha-Levi of Toledo, who wrote the Sepher Hakkabalah about 1160 A.D., tells us (Qabbalah, Phila., 1888, p. 5) that Rabbi Moses, a renowned member of the school of Sura, had been captured with three other distinguished Rabbis when sailing from Bari. Ibn Roma-

his, commander of the navy of Abd-er-Rahman an Nasr (912-961 A.D.), who had effected the capture, sold the four Rabbis as slaves. Moses was brought to Cordova in Spain, where he was ransomed as a supposed ignorant man. Rabbi Nathan, who taught in the Synagogue "Keneseth-ham-Midrash" at Cordova, soon discovered the attainments of Rabbi Moses, and yielded to him the leadership of the congregation. Moses' son, R. Ha'noch, followed his father as leader of the Cordova school; it was this master who instructed Samuel ha-Levi ben Joseph Ibn Nagrela (han-Nagid), the illustrious prince-minister of Moorish Spain (from about 1027-1056 A.D.).

Samuel's services to Jewish learning are too manifold to be described in this brief outline. He found time to compose several books on the Talmud, a Jewish history, books on proverbs, prayers, grammars, etc. He systematized a thorough correspondence with the most distinguished Jews of Syria, Egypt, Africa, Irak, and other parts of the civilized world. Numerous copies of the Talmud and the Old Testament were transcribed at his expense and presented to the poorer students. One of his most illustrious protégés was Solomon ben Jehudah Ibn Gebirol, or Aviccebron, who was born at Malaga about 1021 A.D., educated at Saragossa, and died at Valencia about 1070. His poetry is written in Hebrew, his philosophy in Arabic. The Kether Malkuth (Crown of the Kingdom) holds, according to his own opinion, the first place among his numerous hymns. His treatise "On the Will" has been lost. In 1045 he wrote the Tikkun Middoth han-Nephesh (the correction of the manners or faculties of the soul). In consequence of several personal allusions found in this book, Ibn Gebirol had to leave Saragossa in 1046. Another celebrated philosophical treatise of the same author is Mekhor Chayyim, or the Source of Life, called in Latin *De Materia Universali*, or *Fons Vitæ*. Then followed, according to Myer (opus cit. p. 38), Jacob Nazir of Lamei, Abraham Ab-beth-din, Abraham ben David of Posquieres, Isaac the Blind of Beaucaire,

Azriel and Ezra, Jehudah ben Yakar, Jacob ben Shesheth (about 1370 A.D.), Todros ben Joseph Hallevi Abulafia, Abraham ben Samuel Abulafia, Nachmanides, and others.

We must mention several other Rabbis of about the same period, who attained a greater name than these. Rabbi Solomon ben Isaac, known also by the technical name Rashi and by his real or, as some think, fictitious family name, Yarchi. This latter name alludes to the French town Lunel. Yarchi was born at Troyes in France, about 1030 A.D.; he lived, according to some, to the age of 75, according to others to that of 64 years. Rabbi Jacob ben Yakar, and perhaps R. Gershom, were his teachers. Yarchi's writings comprise commentaries on the entire Hebrew Bible, on the Talmud, and the Pirqé Aboth.

Another remarkable Rabbi, Judah ben Hallevi ben Samuel, was born about the end of the eleventh or the beginning of the twelfth century. He endeavored to spread learning, even the elementary knowledge of the Law, by means of poetry, in which he is said to have surpassed all the writers of his nation. At the age of fifty, after a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, he bewailed beneath the walls of Jerusalem the lamentable condition of his people, and was trampled to death under the hoofs of a mounted Arab's horse. Judah ben Hallevi is probably the author of the Book Cosri, though this has been denied by several later writers on Jewish literature. The work is a defence of Rabbinical Judaism against Philosophy, Christianity, Mohammedanism, and Karaitism. Its form is almost a dialogue between King Chosar of the Chasars (probably Bulan) and R. Isaac Sangari, or Sanger.

R. Abraham ben Meir Ezra, or ben Meir ben Ezra, called Aben-Ezra (grandson of Ezra), was born about the beginning of the twelfth century. His mother was a sister of the above-mentioned Judah ben Hallevi, whose daughter he also married. Besides various other works he wrote commentaries on the entire Hebrew Bible; not only were the Arabic and Hebrew languages mastered by him, but the

Rabbinical learning and the philosophy of his time were equally in his possession. Philosopher, astronomer, physician, poet, grammarian, Qabbalist and interpreter of Sacred Scripture as he was, he more than any Jewish Rabbi deserved the name "Hachakham" (the wise). He died at Rhodes, A.D. 1194.

The most illustrious contemporary of Aben-Ezra was R. Moses ben Maimon, generally called by the Jews Rambam, and by the learned in general "Maimonides." Born A.D. 1139 at Cordova, he left his paternal home, while still a youth, because of some ill-usage that he had suffered from his father. He studied the 'Talmud in Lucena, and returned to Cordova only after attaining the age of manhood. Arabic, astronomy, mathematics, and medicine he learned in the school of Averroes, otherwise known as Abdallah Mohammed Ebn Omar Ebn Roshd. Maimonides wrote an explanation of the Mishna in Arabic; having followed in this work the dictates of philosophy rather than the principles of the Gemara, he was accused of heresy and had to seek refuge at Cairo, where he enjoyed the favor and protection of the illustrious Saladin. He spent eight years in composing his principal work, known by the names "Yad chazakah" (strong hand) and "Mishneh Torah" (repetition of the Law). A few years later Maimonides composed in Arabic his *Delalith al Hairin*; the Hebrew title of the work is "More hannebokhim" (guide of the perplexed). Here the difficulties of Sacred Scripture are solved, and its seeming contradictions explained, without the aid of Rabbinic tradition and fable. Hence a new cry of "heresy" rose up against him in Spain; the book was publicly burned, its reading prohibited, and for forty years the Rabbinic world was split up in factions for and against Maimonides. The author, meanwhile, peacefully died at Cairo, at the age of 75 years, A.D. 1214.

Long before Rambam's death was born R. David Kimchi, known by the abbreviated name Raddak. Several writers place his birth-place in Narbonne; Bartolocci asserts that

his birth-place is entirely unknown; Wolf is of opinion that Raddak was a Spaniard by birth, and lived in France. The illustrious Joseph Kimchi was father, and the still more renowned Moses was brother, of David Kimchi. Whether David commented on the Pentateuch is doubtful; he wrote commentaries on the other parts of the Hebrew Bible, a Hebrew grammar, called *Michlol*, and a Lexicon, called *Sepher Shorashim* (book of roots). After several vain attempts to reconcile the friends and foes of Maimonides, whose valiant defender he was, David Kimchi died in Provence, A.D. 1240.

This line of doctors brings the Jewish tradition contained in the *Zohar* down to the time when even that book was made accessible to the public. For those scholars who deny its early authorship by the pupils of R. Simeon ben Yochai, especially R. Abba the Babylonian (see above), generally maintain that R. Mosheh Shem Tob de Leon (A.D. 1250–1305) composed the book with the intent of deceiving his readers concerning its real author. The whole discussion of the *Zohar*'s authenticity may be briefly read in Myer's *Qabbalah* (Phila., 1888), chapters 1, 2, 3; see also *Encyclopæd. Brit.*, edit. 9, vol. xvi. pp. 286 f., the Speaker's Commentary, vol. iv. p. 388. If we, therefore, suppose even the most unfavorable view to be the true one, that the *Zohar* was not merely edited but forged by R. Mosheh de Leon, it still remains true that the book expresses the traditions received in all the Jewish schools of the time as the genuine teaching of their ancestors; how else can we account for the general veneration that was shown to the book from its first appearance? Concerning the authorities for and against the *Zohar*'s antiquity, see Myer's *Qabbalah*, pp. 10 f.





# STANDARD CATHOLIC BOOKS

PUBLISHED BY

**BENZIGER BROTHERS,**

CINCINNATI:  
148 Main St.

NEW YORK:  
36 & 38 BARCLAY ST.

CHICAGO:  
178 Monroe St.

▲ **MOST LIBERAL DISCOUNT** from these Prices (those marked *net* excepted) will be made to Dealers, Clergymen, Religious Institutions, and Schools.  
The Postage on *net* books is extra.

**Abandonment;** or, Absolute Surrender of Self to Divine Providence.  
By Rev. J. P. CAUSSADE, S.J. Translated by Miss ELLA MCMAHON.  
32mo, cloth, 50 cents.

**Aletheia;** or, The Outspoken Truth on the All-important Question of Divine Authoritative Teaching. An exposition of the Catholic Rule of Faith, contrasted with the various Theories of Private and Fallible Interpretation of the Sacred Scriptures. By the Right Rev. J. D. RICARDS, D.D. Second edition. 12mo, cloth, *net*, 80 cents.

**Almanac, Catholic Home.** A charming Annual for Catholics, 25 cts.

**Analysis of the Gospels** of the Sundays of the Year. From the Italian of Angelo Cagnola. By Rev. L. A. LAMBERT, LL.D., Author of "Notes on Ingersoll," etc. 8vo, cloth, *net*, 1 25

**Art of Profiting by our Faults,** according to St. Francis de Sales. From the French of Rev. J. TISSOT, by Miss ELLA MCMAHON. 32mo, cloth, 50 cents.

**Bible, The Holy.** With Annotations, References, and an Historical and Chronological Index. 12mo, cloth, \$1 25  
Imitation morocco..... \$3 00  
Calf, round corners, red and gold edges..... 5 00  
Morocco, ..... 6 00  
Divinity morocco, calf lined, sewed with silk..... *net*, 12 75  
This is a handy edition, printed from clear, new type on good paper, substantially bound, at low prices.

**Birthday Souvenir, or Diary.** With a Subject of Meditation or a Prayer for every Day in the Year. By Mrs. A. E. BUCHANAN. New edition, with ruled pages for memoranda. Cloth, gilt, 50 cents.

**Blessed Ones of 1888:** Bl. Clement Maria Hofbauer, C.S.S.R.; Bl. Louis-Marie Grignon de Montfort; Bl. Brother Ægidius Mary of St. Joseph; Bl. Josephine Mary of St. Agnes. From the German by ELIZA A. DONNELLY. 18mo, cloth, illustrated, 50 cents.

**Blind Friend of the Poor;** Reminiscences of the Life and Works of Mgr. de SEGUR. 18mo, cloth, 50 cents.

**Brownson, Orestes A.,** Literary, Scientific, and Political Views of. Selected from his works, by H. F. BROWNSON. 12mo, cloth, *net*, \$1 25

**Burke, Rev. J. J.** The Reasonableness of the Practices of the Catholic Church. 12mo, paper, 20 cents.

— **The Reasonableness of the Ceremonies** of the Catholic Church, 12mo, paper, 10 cents,

**Canonical Procedure** in Disciplinary and Criminal Cases of Clerics.

A systematic Commentary on the "Instructio S. C. Epp. et Reg. 1880." By the Rev. FRANCIS DROSTE. Edited by the Right Rev. SEBASTIAN G. MESSMER, D.D., Bishop of Green Bay, Wis. 12mo, cloth, *net*, \$1 50

**Catechism of Familiar Things.** Their History, and the Events which led to their Discovery. With a short explanation of some of the principal Natural Phenomena. With 16 full-page Illustrations. Cloth, inked side, \$1 00**Catechism of Perseverance;** or, An Historical, Dogmatic, Moral, Liturgical, Apologetical, Philosophical, and Social Exposition of Religion from the beginning of the World down to our own days. By Mgr. GAUME. From the 10th French edition. 4 vols., *net*, \$7 50**Catholic Belief;** or, a Short and Simple Exposition of Catholic Doctrine. By the Very Rev. JOSEPH FAÀ DI BRUNO, D.D. Author's American edition edited by Rev. LOUIS A. LAMBERT, author of "Notes on Ingersoll," etc. 100th Thousand. 16mo, flexible cloth, 40 cents. 10 copies, \$2.65—50 copies, \$12.00—100 copies, \$20 00 Cloth, red edges, 75 cents.**Catholic Christianity and Modern Unbelief.** A plain and brief statement of the real doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church as opposed to those falsely attributed to her by unbelievers in Revelation. By the Right Rev. J. D. RICARDS, D.D. 12mo, cloth, *net*, \$1 00**Catholic Memoirs of Vermont and New Hampshire.** With sketches of the lives of Rev. Wm. Henry Hoyt and Fanny Allen. Also with accounts heretofore unpublished of the lives of Rev. Daniel Barber, Rev. Horace Barber, S.J., and Jerusha Barber. 12mo, cloth, ink and gold side, \$1 00 Paper, 50 cents.**Catholic Worship.** The Sacraments, Ceremonies, and Festivals of the Church explained in Questions and Answers. From the German of Rev. O. GISLER, by Rev. RICHARD BRENNAN, I.L.D. (25th Thousand.) Paper, 15 cents; per 100, \$9.00. Cloth, 25 cents; per 100, \$15.00.**Catholic Young Man of the Present Day.** Letters to a Young Man by Right Rev. AUGUSTINE EGGER, D.D., Bishop of St. Gall. From the German, by Miss ELLA MCMAHON. 32mo, paper, 15 cents; per 100, \$9.00. Cloth, inked sides, 25 cents; per 100, \$15.00.**Christ on the Altar.** Instructions for the Sundays and Festivals of the Ecclesiastical Year. Explaining how the Life, Miracles, and Teachings of Our Lord in the Holy Land are continued on the Altar of the Parish Church. By Right Rev. LOUIS DE GOESBRIAND, D.D., Bishop of Burlington, Vt. With 2 chromo-lithographs, 63 full-page illustrations, 240 illustrations of the Holy Land and of Bible History, ornamental initials, tail-pieces, etc., etc. Quarto, cloth, rich gold and ink design, gilt edges, \$6 00**Christian Anthropology.** By Rev. JOHN THEIN. With an Introduction by Prof. CHAS. G. HERBERMANN, LL.D. 8vo, cloth, *net*, \$2 50

- Christian Father, The;** what he should be, and what he should do. Together with a Collection of Prayers suitable to his condition. (25th Thousand.) Paper, 25 cents; per 100, \$15.00. Maroquette, 35 cents; per 100, \$21.00. Cloth, 50 cents; per 100, \$30.00.
- Christian Mother, The;** the Education of her Children and her Prayer. With an account of the Archconfraternity of Christian Mothers, together with its rules, prayers, indulgences, etc. (35th Thousand.) Paper, 25 cents; per 100, \$15.00. Maroquette, 35 cents; per 100, \$21.00. Cloth, 50 cents; per 100, \$30.00.
- Compendium Sacrae Liturgiae** Juxta Ritum Romanum una cum Appendice De Jure Ecclesiastico Particulari in America Foederata Sept. vigente scripsit P. WAPELHORST, O.S.F. Crown, 8vo, cloth, *net*, \$2 50
- Cornelius a Lapide's** Great Commentary upon the Gospels. Translated and edited by the Rev. T. W. MOSSMANN, B.A., Oxon. Complete in six vols., *net*, \$18 00
- Correct Thing for Catholics, The.** By LELIA HARDIN BUGG. *Sixth edition.* 16mo, cloth, 75 cents.
- Counsels of a Catholic Mother** to Her Daughter. Translated from the French. 18mo, cloth, 50 cents.
- Counsels of St. Angela** to Her Sisters in Religion. 32mo, cloth, *net*, 25 cents.
- Crown of Thorns, The;** or, The Little Breviary of the Holy Face. A complete Manual of Devotion and Reparation to the Holy Face of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. By the Sisters of the Divine Compassion. 32mo, cloth, 50 cents.
- Eucharistic Gems.** A Thought about the Most Blessed Sacrament for Every Day in the Year. Compiled from the works of the Saints and other devout writers on this great Mystery. By Rev. L. C. COELENBIER. With a steel-plate Frontispiece. 16mo, cloth, gilt sides, 75 cents.
- Examination of Conscience** for the use of Priests who are making a Retreat. From the French of GADUEL. Adapted by Rev. EUGENE GRIMM, C.S.S.R. Cloth, flexible, red edges, *net*, 30 cents.
- Explanation of the Baltimore Catechism** of Christian Doctrine. For the use of Sunday-school Teachers and Advanced Classes. By Rev. THOMAS L. KINKEAD. 12mo, cloth, *net*, \$1 00
- Fabiola;** or, the Church of the Catacombs. By CARDINAL WISEMAN. **Illustrated Edition.** Contains an exquisite, artistic Chromo-Frontispiece, 32 full-page Illustrations and numerous engravings. 4to, cloth, artistic design on side in gold and ink, red edges, \$6 00  
The same, gilt edges, \$7 50
- Finn, Rev. Francis J., S.J.**  
**Tom Playfair;** or, Making a Start. 12mo, cloth gilt. With a Frontispiece, \$1 00  
**Percy Wynn;** or, Making a Boy of Him. A Story of Boy Life at Boarding-School. With a Frontispiece. 12mo, cloth gilt, \$1 00  
**Harry Dee;** or, Making it Out. 12mo, cloth gilt. With a Frontispiece, \$1 00

**First Communicant's Manual.** This book, prepared expressly for the use of those about to make their first Communion, contains a greater and richer collection of prayers and devotions relating to the Adorable Sacrament than any other prayer-book of its size. It is embellished with numerous full-page illustrations, head-bands, tail-pieces, and an illustrated Way of the Cross.

Red line edition. 32mo. Prices from 45 cents to \$4.00.

Edition without red line. Small 32mo. Prices from 90 cents to \$5.00

**Francis de Sales, St.**

**Maxims and Counsels of.** For Every Day of the Year. From the French by Miss ELLA MCMAHON. 32mo, cloth, 50 cents.

**New Year Greetings.** From the French by Miss MAGARET A. COLTON. 32mo, maroquette, full gilt side, 15 cents; per 100, \$10 00

**General Principles of the Religious Life.** By Very Rev. BONIFACE F. VERHEYEN, O.S.B. 32mo, cloth, *net*, 30 cents.

**Glories of Divine Grace.** Translated from the German of Dr. M. JOS. SCHEEBEN, by a BENEDICTINE MONK of St. Meinrad's Abbey, Ind. Second, revised edition. 12mo, cloth, *net*, \$1 50

**God Knowable and Known.** By Rev. MAURICE RONAYNE, S.J. 12mo, cloth, *net*, \$1 25

**Goffine's Devout Instructions** on the Epistles and Gospels for the Sundays and Holidays; with Explanations of Christian Faith and Duty and of Church Ceremonies. With eight full-page Illustrations. Crown 8vo, cloth, ink and gold side, \$1 50

**"Golden Sands,"** Books by the author of. Translated from the French by Miss ELLA MCMAHON. Each with a steel-plate Frontispiece.

Third Series, 32mo, cloth, 60 cents.

Fourth Series, 32mo, cloth, 60 cents.

Fifth Series, 32mo, cloth, 60 cents.

100 Persian calf, padded, gilt title and floral design, round corners, edges red under gold..... \$1 20

127 German calf, limp, gilt centre, round corners, edges red under gold..... 1 80

**Book of the Professed.** 32mo, cloth.

Vol. I.	} Each with a steel-plate Frontispiece.	{	\$1 00
Vol. II.			0 75
Vol. III.			0 75

**Prayer.** Offered to Novices and Pious People of the World. (Taken from the "Book of the Professed.") Cloth, 50 cents.

**The Little Book of Superiors.** With a steel-plate Frontispiece. 32mo, cloth, 75 cents.

**Spiritual Direction.** For the use of Religious Communities. With a steel-plate Frontispiece. 32mo, cloth, 75 cents.

**Little Month of May.** 32mo, maroquette, 25 cents.

**Little Month of the Souls in Purgatory.** With Prayers for the Suffering Souls, a Rosary, a Way of the Cross, and a Manner of Hearing Mass for the Souls in Purgatory. 32mo, black maroquette, 35 cents.

**Hints on Letter Writing** for Academies and for Self Instruction. 16mo, cloth, 60 cents.

**Golden Prayer, The.** Short Meditations on the Lord's Prayer for Every Day in the Week. With other Meditations on Prayer for Every Day in the Month. From the French of the ABBÉ DUQUESNE, by ANNE STUART BAILEY.

Paper, 10 cents; per 100, \$6 00

Maroquette, 20 " " 12 00

The same, fine edition, with red line, cloth gilt, 50 cents.

**Greetings to the Christ-Child.** A Collection of Christmas Poems for the Young. Embellished with 9 Illustrations, Tail-pieces, etc., etc. Square 16mo, full gilt side, 50 cents.

**Handbook for Altar Societies** and Guide for Sacristans and others having charge of the Altar and Sanctuary. By a MEMBER OF AN ALTAR SOCIETY. 16mo, cloth, red edges, net, 75 cents.

**Handbook of the Christian Religion.** For the use of Advanced Students and the Educated Laity. By Rev. W. WILMERS, S.J. From the German. Edited by Rev. JAMES CONWAY, S.J. Second edition, with supplement. 12mo, cloth, net, \$1 50

**Happy Year, A;** or, the Year Sanctified by meditating on the Maxims and Sayings of the Saints. From the French of ABBÉ LASAUSSE, by Mrs. JAMES O'BRIEN. 12mo, cloth, net, \$1 00

**Heart, The, of St. Jane Frances de Chantal.** Thoughts and Prayers compiled from the French by the Sisters of the Divine Compassion. 32mo, cloth, with portrait of the Saint, 50 cents.

**Hidden Treasure;** or, The Value and Excellence of the Holy Mass. With a Practical and Devout Method of Hearing it with Profit. By the BLESSED LEONARD OF PORT-MAURICE. 32mo, cloth, 50 cents.

**History of Confession;** or, the Dogma of Confession Vindicated from the attacks of Heretics and Infidels. From the French of Rev. AMBROISE GUILLOIS, by Right Rev. LOUIS DE GOESBRIAND, D.D., Bishop of Burlington, Vt. 16mo, cloth, net, 75 cents.

**History of the Catholic Church** within the Limits of the United States, from the first attempted Colonization to the present time. By JOHN GILMARY SHEA. Bound in cloth, per volume. net, \$5 00

Vol. I. The Catholic Church in Colonial Days.

Vol. II. Life and Times of Archbishop Carroll.

Vol. III. From the Division of the Diocese of Baltimore to the Fifth Council of Baltimore, 1843.

Vol. IV. From the Fifth Provincial Council of Baltimore, 1843, to the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore, 1866.

**History of the Catholic Church,** by Dr. H. BRUECK, with Additions from the Writings of His Eminence Cardinal Hergenröther. Translated by Rev. E. PRUENTE. With an Introduction by the Rt. Rev. J. A. CORCORAN, S.T.D. Second edition. 2 vols., 8vo, cloth, net, \$3 00

**History of the Catholic Church.** Adapted from the original of Rev. L. C. BUSINGER, by Rev. RICHARD BRENNAN, LL.D. Together with a History of the Church in America, by JOHN GILMARY SHEA, LL.D. With 90 Illustrations. 8vo, cloth, ink and gold side, \$2 00

**Holy Face of Jesus, The.** A Series of Meditations on the Litany of the Holy Face. Adapted from the French of the Abbé J. B. FOURAULT, by the Sisters of the Divine Compassion. 32mo, cloth, 50 cents.

**Home Rule Movement,** with a Sketch of Irish Parties from 1843. By T. P. O'CONNOR, M.P. Large 8vo, 578 pages, cloth, \$3 50

**Hours Before the Altar;** or, Meditations on the Holy Eucharist. By Mgr. DE LA BOUILLERIE. 32mo, cloth, 50 cents.

**How They Worked Their Way,** and other Tales. (Stories of Duty.) By M. F. EGAN, LL.D. 12mo, cloth, \$1 00

**How to Get On.** By Rev. BERNARD FEENEY. With an Introduction by His Grace, the Most Rev. WM. H. GROSS, D.D., C.S.S.R. 12mo, paper, 50 cents; cloth, \$1 00

**Hunolt's Sermons.** Sermons by the Rev. FRANCIS HUNOLT, Priest of the Society of Jesus and Preacher in the Cathedral of Treves. Translated from the original German edition of Cologne, 1740, by the Rev. J. ALLEN, D.D., Chaplain of the Dominican Convent of the Sacred Heart, King Williamstown, South Africa.

The Sermons are adapted to all the Sundays and Holy-days of the Year, and each set contains a full index of all the sermons, an alphabetical index of the principal subjects treated, and copious marginal notes. Per set of 2 vols., *net*, \$5 00

Vols. 1, 2. The Christian State of Life.

Vols. 3, 4. The Bad Christian.

Vols. 5, 6. The Penitent Christian.

Vols. 7, 8. The Good Christian.

Vols. 9, 10. The Christian's Last End. *In press.*

Vols. 11, 12. The Christian's Model. *In preparation.*

**Idols;** or, The Secret of the Rue Chaussée d'Antin. Translated from the French of RAOUL DE NAVERY, by Miss ANNA T. SADLER. Second edition, revised. 12mo, cloth, \$1 25

**Instructions on the Commandments** of God and the Sacraments of the Church. From the Italian of St. ALPHONSUS DE LIGUORI. Edited by Rev. EUGENE GRIMM, C.S.S.R. 32mo, cloth, 50 cents; maroquette, 35 cents.

**Interior of Jesus and Mary.** By Père Grou. New edition. Revised and edited by Rev. S. H. FRISBEE, S.J. 2 vols., 12mo, cloth, *net*, \$2 00

**Joseph, St., the Advocate of Hopeless Cases.** From the French of Rev. Father HUGUET, Marist. 32mo, cloth, \$1 00

**Konings, Theologia Moralis.** Novissimi Ecclesie Doctoris S. Alphonsi. In Compendium Redacta, et Usui Venerabilis Cleri Americani Accommodata, Auctore A. KONINGS, C.S.S.R. Editio septima, auctior, et novis curis expolitor, curante HENRICO KUPFER, C.S.S.R. Two vols., royal 8vo, half morocco, *net*, \$5 00  
The two vols. in one, half morocco, *net*, \$ 400

**Leper Queen, The.** A Story of the Thirteenth Century. 16mo, cloth, 50 cents.



**Life and Acts of Leo XIII.** Preceded by a sketch of the Last Days of Pius IX., and the Origin and Laws of the Conclave. New and enlarged edition. Compiled and translated from Authentic Sources, by Rev. JOSEPH E. KELLER, S.J. Fully and beautifully illustrated. Crown 8vo, cloth, full gilt side, \$2 00

**Life of St. Clare of Montefalco,** Professed Nun of the Order of Hermits of St. Augustine. Translated by Rev. JOSEPH A. LOCKE, O.S.A. 12mo, cloth, \$1 00

**Life of St. Ignatius of Loyola.** By Father Genelli, of the Society of Jesus. With a steel-plate Frontispiece. 12mo, cloth, \$1 50

**Life of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ and of His Blessed Mother.** Translated and adapted from the original of Rev. L. C. BUSINGER by Rev. RICHARD BRENNAN, LL.D. With nearly 600 choice Engravings.

- No. 1. Roan back, gold title, plain cloth sides, sprinkled edges.....*net*, \$5 00
- No. 3. Morocco back and corners, cloth sides with gold stamp, gilt edges..*net*, 7 00
- No. 4. Full morocco, richly gilt back, with large figure of Our Lord in gold on side, gilt edges.....*net*, 9 00
- No. 5. Full morocco, block-panelled sides, superbly gilt, gilt edges.....*net*, 10 00

**Life of Father Charles Sire,** of the Society of Jesus. A Simple Biography compiled from his Writings and the Testimony of those who have known him best. By his brother, Rev. VITAL SIRE. 12mo, cloth, *net*, \$1 00

**Life of Father Jogues,** Missionary Priest of the Society of Jesus. Slain by the Mohawk Iroquois, in the present State of New York, October 18, 1646. By Father FELIX MARTIN, S.J. With Father Jogues' Account of the Captivity and Death of his Companion, René Goupil, slain September 29, 1642. Translated from the French by JOHN GILMARY SHEA. Second, revised edition. 12mo, cloth, \$1 00

**Life of Mlle. Le Gras** (Louise de Marillac), Foundress of the Sisters of Charity and Co-operator of St. Vincent de Paul. From the French by a SISTER OF CHARITY. 12mo, cloth, \$1 50

**Life of the Ven. Mary Crescentia Höss,** of the Third Order of St. Francis. Drawn from the Acts of her Beatification and other reliable sources. 12mo, cloth, ink and gold side, \$1 50

**Life of St. Germaine Cousin,** the Shepherd Maiden of Pibrac. From the French by a SISTER OF MERCY. 16mo, cloth, 50 cents.

**Life of St. Aloysius Gonzaga.** From the Italian of Rev. Father CEPARI, S.J. With Original Notes and an Appendix. Edited by Rev. F. GOLDIE, S.J. With a chromo-lithographic portrait as frontispiece, phototype fac-simile of letter, 11 interleaved illustrations, and 108 other illustrations from historical documents, portraits, interiors, exteriors, plans, genealogical tables, etc. 8vo, cloth, beautifully bound, *net*, \$2 50

**Life of St. Francis di Geronimo** of the Society of Jesus. 12mo, cloth, *net*, \$1 75

**Life of Right Rev. John N. Neumann, D.D.,** Fourth Bishop of Philadelphia. From the German of Rev. A. BERGER, C.S.S.R., by Rev. EUG. GRIMM, C.S.S.R. 12mo, cloth. With portrait, *net*, \$1 50

**Life of Mary for Children, The.** From the German, by ANNE R. BENNETT, née GLADSTONE. Illustrated. 24mo, cloth, *net*, 50 cents.

**Life of Rev. Mother St. John Fontbonne,** Foundress and First Superior-General of the Congregation of the Sisters of St. Joseph in Lyons. From the French of ABBÉ RIVAUX. With a steel portrait, engraved expressly for this work. 12mo, cloth, \$1 50

**Life, Popular, of St. Teresa of Jesus.** From the French of L'ABBÉ MARIE-JOSEPH, of the Order of Carmel, by ANNIE PORTER. With a steel-plate Frontispiece. Cloth, ink and gold side, \$1 00

**Liguori, St. Alphonsus de, Complete Ascetical Works of.** Centenary Edition. Edited by Rev. EUGENE GRIMM, C.S.S.R. This, the first complete, uniform edition in English of the works of this great Doctor of the Church will be in 24 volumes, of about 500 pages each, and offered at the uniform price, per volume, of *net*, \$1 25

Each book is complete in itself, and any volume will be sold separately. Volumes 1 to 19 are now ready.

This edition of St. Alphonsus' Works has been honored with a letter from Our Holy Father Pope Leo XIII.

**Linked Lives.** By Lady GERTRUDE DOUGLASS. Crown 8vo, cloth, \$1 50

**Little Compliments of the Season.** Simple Verses for Namedays, Birthdays, Christmas, New Year, and other festive and social occasions. With numerous and appropriate illustrations. By ELEANOR C. DONNELLY. 16mo, cloth, *net*, 50 cents.

**Little Office of the Immaculate Conception,** explained in Short Conferences. By Very Rev. JOSEPH RAINER. With Prayers. Suitable for Sodalties of the Blessed Virgin. 32mo, cloth, *net*, 50 cents.

**Little Saint of Nine Years.** A Biographical Notice. From the French of Mgr. DE SEGUR, by Miss MARY McMAHON. 16mo, cloth, 50 cents.

**Lives, Short, of the Saints; or, Our Birthday Bouquet.** Culled from the Shrines of the Saints and the Gardens of the Poets. By ELEANOR C. DONNELLY. Third edition. Cloth, gilt side, \$1 00

**Lives of the Deceased Bishops** of the Catholic Church in the United States. By RICHARD H. CLARKE, LL.D. 3 vols., 8vo, cloth, per set, *net*, \$7 50

**Lourdes.** Its Inhabitants, Its Pilgrims, Its Miracles. By R. F. CLARKE, S.J. Illustrated. 16mo, cloth, 75 cents.

**Luther's Own Statements** Concerning his Teachings and its Results. Taken exclusively from the earliest and best editions of his German and Latin Works. By HENRY O'CONNOR, S.J. 12mo, paper, 15 cents.

- Manifestation of Conscience.** Confessions and Communions in Religious Communities. A Commentary on the Decree "Quemadmodum" of December 17, 1890. From the French of Rev. Pie de Langogne, O.M. Cap. With the original Decree and the Official Translation. 32mo, cloth, *net*, 50 cents.
- Manual of Indulged Prayers.** A Complete Prayer-book. Arranged and disposed for daily use by Rev. BONAVENTURE HAMMER, O.S.F. (Prov. S. Joan. Bapt.) Small 32mo, cloth, inked sides, 40 cents.
- Marriage.** By Very Rev. PÈRE MONSABRÉ, C.P. From the French, by M. HOPPER. 12mo, cloth, *net*, \$1 00
- Martyr, A, of Our Own Times.** Life of Rev. JUST DE BRETENIÈRES, Missionary Apostolic and Martyr in Corea. From the French of the Right Rev. Mgr. D'HULST, Rector of the Catholic Institute, Paris. Edited by Very Rev. J. R. SLATTERY. 12mo, cloth, *net*, 75 cents.
- McCallen, Rev. James A., S.S.**
- Sanctuary Boy's Illustrated Manual.** Embracing the Ceremonies of the Inferior Ministers at Low Mass, Solemn High Mass, Vespers, Asperges, Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, and Absolution for the Dead. With numerous illustrations. Fourth edition. 12mo, cloth, *net*, 50 cents.
- The Office of Tenebrae.** Transposed from the Gregorian chant into Modern Notation :
- Complete Office and Appendix.** Cloth, *net*, \$1 65
- Complete Office without Appendix.** Cloth, *net*, \$1 00
- Appendix,** containing harmonizations of the Lamentations separately. Cloth, *net*, 0 75
- Meditations, New Practical,** for Every Day in the Year, on the Life of Our Lord Jesus Christ. Chiefly intended for the use of religious communities. By the Rev. Father BRUNO VERCRUYSE, S.J. The only complete English translation. Published with the Approbation and under the direction of the author. Enriched by several Novenas and Octaves; Meditations for the First Friday of every Month and for the days of Communion; Exercises preparatory to the Renewal of Vows, and for a Retreat of eight Days, etc. 2 vols., 1244 pages. Extra cloth, beveled boards, red edges, \$4 00
- Meditations on the Passion of Our Lord.** Together with a Manual of the Black Scapular of the Passion, and Daily Prayers. From the Italian, by a PASSIONIST FATHER. With 14 full-page Illustrations of the Way of the Cross. 32mo, cloth, red edges, 40 cents.
- Meditations for Every Day in the Year.** Collected from different Spiritual Writers and suited for the Practice called "Quarter of an Hour's Solitude." Edited by Rev. ROGER BAXTER, S.J., of Georgetown College. It is now republished and revised in the 251st year of Jesuit labor in the United States, by Rev. P. NEALE, S.J. Second edition. Small 12mo, cloth, red edges, *net*, \$1 25
- Meditations on the Sufferings of Jesus Christ.** From the Italian of Rev. FRANCIS DA PERINALDO, O.S.F., by a member of the same Order. 12mo, cloth, \$1 25

**Merrick, Rev. D. A., S.J.**

**Saints of the Society of Jesus.** 16mo, paper, *net*, 10 cents; cloth gilt, *net*, 25 cents.

**A Sketch of the Society of Jesus.** 16mo, paper, *net*, 10 cents; cloth gilt, *net*, 25 cents.

**Miraculous Power of the Memorare**, illustrated by Examples.

From the French of a Marist Father, by Miss ELLA McMAHON. Paper, 10 cents; per 100, \$6 00

Maroquette, 20 cents; per 100, \$12 00

**Mistress of Novices, The**, instructed in her Duties; or, a Method of Direction for the use of Persons charged with the Training of Souls in Christian Perfection. From the French of the ABBÉ LEGUAY, by Rev. IGNATIUS SISK. 12mo, cloth, *net*, 75 cents.

**Monk's Pardon.** A Historical Romance of the Time of Philip IV. of Spain. From the French of RAOUL DE NAVERY by ANNA T. SADLER. 12mo, cloth, \$1 25

**Month of the Dead; or, Prompt and Easy Deliverance of the Souls in Purgatory.** From the French of the ABBÉ CLOQUET, by a SISTER OF MERCY. Approved by the Sacred Congregation, by His Lordship, the Archbishop of Bourges, and His Grace, the Archbishop of New York. With a steel-plate Frontispiece. 32mo, cloth, 75 cents.

**Month of May.** From the French of Father DEBUSSI, S.J., by Miss ELLA McMAHON. 4th edition. 24mo, cloth, 50 cents.

**Muller, Rev. Michael, C.S.S.R.**

**God the Teacher of Mankind.** A plain, comprehensive Explanation of Christian Doctrine. 9 vols., crown 8vo, cloth.

The Church and her Enemies, *net*, \$1 10

The Apostles' Creed, *net*, 1 10

The First and Greatest Commandment, *net*, 1 40

Explanation of the Commandments, continued. Precepts of the Church, *net*, 1 10

Dignity, Authority, and Duties of Parents, Ecclesiastical and Civil Powers. Their Enemies, *net*, 1 40

Grace and the Sacraments, *net*, 1 25

Holy Mass, *net*, 1 25

Eucharist and Penance, *net*, 1 10

Sacramentals—Prayers, etc., *net*, 1 00

**Familiar Explanation of Catholic Doctrine** for the Family and more Advanced Students in Catholic Colleges, Academies, and High Schools, for Persons of Culture, Old as well as Young. With a popular Refutation of the Principal Modern Errors. 12mo, cloth, \$1 00

**The Prodigal Son; or, The Sinner's Return to God** Crown 8vo, cloth, *net*, \$1 00

**The Devotion of the Holy Rosary and the Five Scapulars.** Crown 8vo, *net*, 75 cents.

**No Salvation out of the Church.** Crown 8vo, cloth, *net*, \$1 00

**The Catholic Priesthood.** 2 vols. Crown 8vo, cloth, *net*, \$3 00

- My First Communion: The Happiest Day of My Life.** A Preparation and Remembrance for First Communicants. From the German of Rev. J. N. BUCHMANN, O.S.B., by Rev. RICHARD BRENNAN, LL.D. 16mo, cloth, elegant. Illustrated, 75 cents.
- Names that Live in Catholic Hearts.** Cardinal Ximenes—Michael Angelo—Samuel de Champlain—Archbishop Plunkett—Charles Carroll—Henry Larochejacquelein—Simon de Montfort. By Miss ANNA T. SADLER. 12mo, cloth, \$1 00
- Natalie Narischkin,** Sister of Charity of St. Vincent of Paul. From the French by Lady G. FULLERTON. 12mo, cloth, \$1 00
- Novena in Honor of the Holy Face of Our Lord.** Adapted from the French by the Sisters of the Divine Compassion. Paper, 10 cents; per 100, \$6 00  
Maroquette, 20 cents; per 100, 12 00
- Novena in Honor of St. Catharine de Ricci,** a Religious of the Third Order of St. Dominic. By the Dominican Sisters, Albany, N. Y. 32mo, paper, *net*, 10 cents.
- O'Grady, Eleanor.**
- Aids to Correct and Effective Elocution.** With Selected Readings and Recitations for Practice. 12mo, cloth, \$1 25
- Select Recitations for Catholic Schools and Academies.** 12mo, cloth, \$1 00
- Readings and Recitations for Juniors.** 16mo, cloth, *net*, 50 cents.
- On Christian Art.** By EDITH HEALY. 16mo, cloth, 50 cents.
- On the Condition of Labor.** Encyclical Letter of Our Holy Father, Pope Leo XIII. 8vo, paper, 10 cents; per 100, \$6 00
- One Angel More in Heaven.** With Letters of Condolence and of Consolation by St. Francis de Sales and others. White mar., 50 cents.
- Our Birthday Bouquet.** Culled from the Shrines of the Saints and the Gardens of the Poets. By ELEANOR C. DONNELLY. 16mo, cloth, \$1 00
- Our Lady of Good Counsel in Genazzano.** A History of that Ancient Sanctuary and of the wonderful Apparition and Miraculous Translation in 1467 of Our Lady's Sacred Image from Scutari to Genazzano. By ANNE R. BENNETT, née GLADSTONE, 32mo, cloth, 75 cts.
- Our Own Will and How to Detect it in Our Actions.** Instructions intended for Religious. Applicable also to all who aim at the Perfect Life. By the Rev. JOHN ALLEN, D.D. 12mo, cloth, *net*, 75 cents.
- Paradise on Earth Opened to All; or, A Religious Vocation the Surest Way in Life.** 32mo, cloth, 50 cents.
- Path which led a Protestant Lawyer to the Catholic Church.** By P. H. BURNETT. 8vo, cloth, \$2 00

## Philosophy, English Manuals of Catholic.

1. **Logic.** By RICHARD F. CLARKE, S.J. 12mo, cloth, *net*, \$1 25
2. **First Principles of Knowledge.** By JOHN RICKABY, S.J., Professor of Logic and General Metaphysics at St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst. 12mo, cloth, *net*, \$1 25
3. **Moral Philosophy (Ethics and Natural Law).** By JOSEPH RICKABY, S.J. 12mo, cloth, *net*, \$1 25
4. **Natural Theology.** By BERNARD BOEDDER, S.J., Professor of Natural Theology at Stonyhurst. 12mo, cloth, *net*, \$1 50
5. **Psychology.** By MICHAEL MAHER, S.J., Professor of Mental Philosophy at Stonyhurst College. 12mo, cloth, *net*, \$1 50
6. **General Metaphysics.** By JOHN RICKABY, S.J. 12mo, cloth, *net*, \$1 25
7. **A Manual of Political Economy.** By C. S. DEVAS, Esq., M.A., Examiner in Economy in the Royal University of Ireland. 12mo, cloth, *net*, \$1 50

**Pictorial Lives of the Saints.** With Reflections for Every Day in the Year. Including the Lives of the American Saints recently placed on the Calendar for the United States by petition of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, and also the Lives of the Saints, canonized in 1881 by His Holiness Pope Leo XIII. Edited by JOHN GILMARY SHEA, LL.D. 50th Thousand. 8vo, cloth, \$2 00  
5 copies, \$6.65—10 copies, \$12.50—25 copies, \$27.50—50 copies, \$50.00.

**Practice of Humility, The.** By His Holiness Pope Leo XIII.

From the Italian by Rev. J. F. X. O'CONOR, S.J. 32mo.

With red line. Cloth gilt, 50 cents.

Without red line.

Paper, 10 cents; per 100, \$6 00

Maroquette, 20 " " 12 00

**Praxis Synodalis. Manuale Synodi Diocesanae ac Provincialis Celebrandae.** 12mo, cloth, *net*, 60 cents.

**Primer for Converts, A.** Showing the Reasonable Service of Catholics. By Rev. J. T. DURWARD. 32mo, cloth, flexible, *net*, 25 cents.

**Principles of Anthropology and Biology.** By Rev. THOMAS HUGHES, S.J. Second edition. 16mo, cloth, *net*, 75 cents.

**Reading and the Mind, with Something to Read.** By Rev. J. F. X. O'CONOR, S.J. Second edition. Paper, 25 cents.

**Religious State, The.** Together with a Short Treatise on the Vocation to the Priesthood. From the Italian of St. ALPHONSUS DE LIGUORI. Edited by Rev. EUGENE GRIMM, C.SS.R. 32mo, cloth, 50 cents.

**Rights of Our Little Ones; or, First Principles on Education in Catechetical Form.** By Rev. JAMES CONWAY, S.J.

32mo, paper, 15 cents; per 100, \$9 00

" cloth inked, 25 " " 12 00

**Rosary, The Most Holy, in Thirty-one Meditations, Prayers, and Examples, suitable for the Months of May and October.** With prayers. By Rev. EUGENE GRIMM, C.SS.R. 32mo, cloth, 50 cents.  
Marquette, 35 cents.



**Russo, N., S.J.**—De Philosophia Morali Prælectiones in Collegio Georgiopolitano Soc. Jes. Anno 1889-90 Habitaæ, a Patre NICOLAO RUSSO. Editio altera. 8vo, half leather, *net*, \$2 00

**Sacramentals of the Holy Catholic Church, The.** By Rev. A. A. LAMBING, LL.D., author of "A History of the Catholic Church in the Dioceses of Pittsburgh and Alleghany," etc. 12mo, cloth, *net*, \$1 25

### Sacred Heart, Books on the.

**Devotions to the Sacred Heart for the First Friday of Every Month.** From the French of P. HUGUET, Marist, by a SISTER OF MERCY. Cloth, red edges, with a steel-plate Frontispiece, 40 cents.

213. Imitation Levant, limp, gilt centre, round corners, edges red under gold, \$1 35

**Familiar Conferences on the Theology of the Sacred Heart of Jesus.** By Rev. E. M. HENNESSY. 12mo, cloth, \$1.00; paper, 50 cents.

**Imitation of the Sacred Heart of Jesus.** By Rev. F. ARNOUDT, S.J. From the Latin by Rev. J. M. FASTRE, S.J. 12mo, cloth, \$2 00

**Month of the Sacred Heart of Jesus.** Devotions for Every day of the Month. From the French of Rev. Father HUGUET, by a SISTER OF MERCY. 32mo, cloth, 75 cents.

**One and Thirty Days with Blessed Margaret Mary.** From the French by a Visitandine of Baltimore. 32mo, maroquette, 25 cents.

**Pearls from the Casket of the Sacred Heart of Jesus.** A Collection of the Letters, Maxims, and Practices of the Blessed MARGARET MARY ALACOQUE. Edited by ELEANOR C. DONNELLY. 32mo, cloth, red edges, gilt side. With a steel-plate Frontispiece, 50 cents.

**Sacred Heart, Month of the, for the Young Christian.** By BROTHER PHILIPPE. From the French by E. A. MULLIGAN. 32mo, cloth, 50 cents.

**Sacred Heart of Jesus.** Short Meditations for the Month of June. By R. F. CLARKE, S.J. 18mo, mar., gilt side, 15 cents; per 100, \$10 00

**Sacred Heart Studied in the Sacred Scriptures.** By Rev. II. SAINTRAIN, C.S.S.R. Crown 8vo, cloth, *net*, \$2 00

**Sacred Heart, Revelations of the, to Blessed Margaret Mary; and the History of her Life.** From the French of Monseigneur BOUGAUD, by a Visitandine of Baltimore. Crown 8vo, cloth, *net*, \$1 50

**Year of the Sacred Heart.** A Thought for Every Day of the Year. Drawn from the works of PÈRE DE LA COLOMBIÈRE, of Blessed MARGARET MARY, and of others. 32mo, cloth, 50 cents.

**Saints, The New, of 1888:** St. John Berchmans, S.J.; St. Peter Claver, S.J.; St. Alphonsus Rodriguez, S.J.; and the Seven Sainted Founders of the Servites. By Rev. FRANCIS GOLDIE, S.J., and Rev. Father SCOLA, S.J. 18mo, cloth. With 4 full-page illustrations, 50 cts.

- Schouppe, Short Sermons for Low Masses.** Comprising a complete, brief course of instruction on Christian Doctrine. By Rev. F. X. SCHOUPPE S.J. Second edition. 12mo, cloth, *net*, \$1 25
- Secret of Sanctity, The.** According to St. FRANCIS DE SALES and Father CRASSET, S.J. From the French, by Miss ELLA McMAHON. 12mo, cloth, *net*, \$1 00
- Seraphic Guide.** A Manual for the Members of the Third Order of St. Francis. According to the recent decisions of the Holy See. By A FRANCISCAN FATHER. (Cust. S. Joan. Bapt.) Cloth, 60 cents. Roan, red edges, 75 cents.  
The same in German at the same prices.
- Sermons for the Sundays and Chief Festivals of the Ecclesiastical Year.** With Two Courses of Lenten Sermons and a Triduum for the Forty Hours. By Rev. JULIUS POTTGEISSER, S.J. From the German by Rev. JAMES CONWAY, S.J. 2 vols., 12mo, cloth, *net*, \$2 50
- Sermons Moral and Dogmatic on the Fifteen Mysteries of the Holy Rosary.** By Rev. M. J. FRINGS. Translated by J. R. ROBINSON. 12mo, cloth, *net*, \$1 00
- Short Stories on Christian Doctrine:** A Collection of Examples illustrating the Catechism. From the French by Miss MARY McMAHON. 12mo, cloth. With six full-page illustrations, \$1 00
- Simplicity in Prayer.** From the French, by a Daughter of St. FRANCIS DE SALES, Baltimore. 32mo, cloth, *net*, 30 cents.
- Six Sermons on Devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus.** From the German of Rev. Dr. E. BIERBAUM, by Miss ELLA McMAHON. 16mo, cloth, *net*, 0 60
- Smith, Rev. S. B., D.D.**
- Elements of Ecclesiastical Law.** Compiled with reference to the Syllabus, the "Const. Apostolicæ Sedis" of Pope Pius IX., the Council of the Vatican, and the latest decisions of the Roman Congregations.  
Vol. I. Ecclesiastical Persons. 8vo, cloth, *net*, \$2 50  
Vol. II. Ecclesiastical Trials. 8vo, cloth, *net*, \$2 50  
Vol. III. Ecclesiastical Punishments. 8vo, cloth, *net*, \$2 50
- **Compendium Juris Canonici**, ad usum Cleri et Seminariorum, hujus regionis accomodatum. Third edition. Crown 8vo, cloth, *net*, \$2 00
- **The Marriage Process in the United States.** 8vo, cloth, *net*, \$2 50
- Socialism Exposed and Refuted.** By Rev. VICTOR CATHEIN, S.J. A Chapter from the author's Moral Philosophy. From the German. By Rev. JAMES CONWAY, S.J. 12mo, cloth, *net*, 75 cents.
- Solid Virtue:** A Triduum and Spiritual Conferences. By Rev. FATHER BELLECIUS, S.J. From the Latin, by a FATHER OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS. With the permission of Superiors. 16mo, cloth, 60 cents.

- Souvenir of the Novitiate.** Especially intended for the use of Religious Communities devoted to the Education of Youth. From the French by Rev. EDWARD I. TAYLOR. 32mo, cloth, 75 cents.
- Spiritual Crumbs for Hungry Little Souls.** To which are added Stories from the Bible. By MARY E. RICHARDSON. 16mo, cloth, *net*, 40 cents.
- Stories for First Communicants,** for the Time before and after First Communion. Drawn from the best authorities by Rev. J. A. KELLER, D.D. 32mo, cloth, 50 cents; maroquette, 35 cents.
- St. Teresa's Own Words;** or, Instructions on the Prayer of Recollection. 32mo, cloth, 50 cents.
- Sunday-School Teacher's Manual;** or, The Art of teaching Catechism. For the use of Teachers and Parents. By Rev. A. A. LAMBING. 16mo, cloth, 75 cents.
- Sure Way to a Happy Marriage.** A Book of Instructions for those Betrothed and for Married People. From the German by Rev. EDWARD I. TAYLOR. (25th Thousand.)  
 Paper, 30 cents; per 100, \$18 00  
 Maroquette, 40 " " 24 00  
 Cloth, 60 " " 36 00
- Tales and Legends of the Middle Ages.** From the Spanish of F. DE P. CAPELLA. By HENRY WILSON. 16mo, fancy binding, \$1 00
- Think Well On't;** or, Reflections on the Great Truths of the Christian Religion, for every Day of the Month. By the Right Rev. R. CHALLONER, D.D. 32mo, cloth, flexible, 20 cents.
- Thought from St. Alphonsus,** for Every Day of the Year. 32mo, cloth, 50 cents.
- Thought from Benedictine Saints.** 32mo, cloth, 50 cents.
- Thought from Dominican Saints.** 32mo, cloth, 50 cents.
- Thought from St. Francis Assisi and his Saints.** 32mo, cloth, 50 cents.
- Thought from St. Ignatius.** 32mo, cloth, 50 cents.
- Thought from St. Teresa.** 32mo, cloth, 50 cents.
- Thought from St. Vincent de Paul.** 32mo, cloth, 50 cents.
- True Spouse of Christ;** or, The Nun Sanctified by the Virtues of her State. By St. ALPHONSUS LIGUORI. Crown 8vo, cloth, \$1 50
- Truths of Salvation.** By Rev. J. PERGMAYR, S.J. From the German by a Father of the same Society. 16mo, cloth, \$1 00
- Twelve Virtues, The, of a Good Teacher.** For Mothers, Instructors, and all charged with the Education of Girls. By Rev. H. POTTIER, S.J. From the French. 32mo, flexible, cloth, red edges, *net*, 30 cents.

# Visits to the Most Holy Sacrament and to the Blessed Virgin

Mary. For Every Day of the Month. By St. ALPHONSUS DE LIGUORI.

Edited by Rev. EUGENE GRIMM. 32mo, cloth, 50 cents; mar., 35 cents.

219 Persian calf, padded, fancy stamping, round corners, edges red under gold \$1 35

127 German calf, limp, gilt centre, round corners, edges red under gold, . . . . . 1 85

# Ward, Rev. Thomas F.

**Thirty-two Instructions for the Month of May** and for the Feasts of the Blessed Virgin. From the French. 12mo, cloth, *net*, 75 cents.

**Fifty-two Instructions on the Principal Truths** of Our Holy Religion. From the French. 12mo, cloth, *net*, 75 cents.

# Way of Interior Peace. Dedicated to Our Lady of Peace. By Rev.

FATHER DE LEHES, S. J. Translated from the German Version of Rev.

JAMES BRUCKER, S. J., by a Religious. 12mo, cloth, *net*, \$1 25

# Weninger's Sermons.

1. Original Short and Practical Sermons for Every Sunday of the Year. Three Sermons for Every Sunday. 8vo, cloth, *net*, \$2 00

2. Sermons for Every Feast of the Ecclesiastical Year. Three Sermons for Every Feast. 8vo, cloth, *net*, \$2 00

3. Conferences specially addressed to Married and Unmarried Men. 8vo, cloth, *net*, \$2 00

4. Conferences for Married and Unmarried Women. 8vo, cloth, *net*, \$2 00

5. Original Short and Practical Sermons in honor of the Blessed Sacrament. Thirty-six Sermons, in twelve divisions, three in each. 8vo, cloth, *net*, \$1 75

# What Catholics have done for Science, with Sketches of the great Catholic Scientists. By Rev. MARTIN S. BRENNAN. 12mo, cloth, \$1 00

# Will of God, The. From the French, by M. A. M. To which is added an easy Method of Attending Holy Mass with Profit, by St. LEONARD of Port-Maurice.

Paper, 10 cents; per 100, \$6 00

Maroquette, 20 " " 12 00

# Women of Catholicity: Margaret O'Carroll—Isabella of Castile—Margaret Roper—Marie de l'Incarnation—Margaret Bourgeoys—Ethan Allen's Daughter. By Miss ANNA T. SADLER. 12mo, cloth, \$1 00

# Words of Jesus Christ during His Passion, explained in their Literal and Moral Sense. Translated from the French of Rev. F. X. SCHOUPE, S. J., by Rev. J. J. QUINN. Maroquette, silver side, 25 cents.

# Words of Wisdom. A Concordance of the Sapiential Books. From the French. 12mo, cloth, *net*, \$1 25

# Zeal in the Work of the Ministry; or, The Means by which every Priest may render his ministry Honorable and Fruitful. From the French of L'ABBÉ DUBOIS. Crown 8vo, cloth, *net*, \$1 50











100  
172  
379

[illegible]



BS648.5 .M12 v.1  
Christ in type and prophecy.

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00007 2902